arXiv:1511.04626v2 [stat.ME] 9 Dec 2015

A Smoothed P-Value Test When There is a Nuisance Parameter under the Alternative

Jonathan B. Hill*
University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill

This Draft: December 10, 2015

Abstract

We present a new test when there is a nuisance parameter λ under the alternative hypothesis. The test exploits the p-value occupation time [PVOT], the measure of the subset of λ on which a p-value test based on a test statistic $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ rejects the null hypothesis. The PVOT has only been explored in Hill and Aguilar (2013) and Hill (2012) as a way to smooth over a trimming parameter for heavy tail robust test statistics. Our key contributions are: (*i*) we show that a weighted average local power of a test based on $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ is identically a weighted average mean PVOT, and the PVOT used for our test is therefore a point estimate of the weighted average probability of PV test rejection, under the null; (*ii*) an asymptotic critical value upper bound for our test is the significance level itself, making inference easy (as opposed to supremum and average test statistic transforms which typically require a bootstrap method for p-value computation); (*iii*) we only require $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ to have a known or bootstrappable limit distribution, hence we do not require $\sqrt{n}$-Gaussian asymptotics as is nearly always assumed, and we allow for some parameters to be weakly or non-identified; and (*iv*) a numerical experiment, in which local asymptotic power is computed for a test of omitted nonlinearity, reveals the asymptotic critical value is *exactly* the significance level, and the PVOT test is virtually equivalent to a test with the greatest weighted average power in the sense of Andrews and Ploberger (1994). We give examples of PVOT tests of omitted nonlinearity, GARCH effects and a one time structural break. A simulation study demonstrates the merits of PVOT test of omitted nonlinearity and GARCH effects, and demonstrates the asymptotic critical value is exactly the significance level.

Key words and phrases: p-value test, empirical process test, nuisance parameter, weighted average power, GARCH test, omitted nonlinearity test.

AMS classifications : 62G10, 62M99, 62F35.

*Dept. of Economics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; www.unc.edu/∼jbhill; jbhill@email.unc.edu.

1 Introduction

We present a test for cases when a nuisance parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is present under the alternative hypothesis H_1, where $k \geq 1$ is finite. Let $\mathcal{Y}_n \equiv \{y_t\}_{t=1}^n$ be the observed sample of data with sample size $n \geq 1$, and let $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) \equiv \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda)$ be a test statistic function of λ for testing a hypothesis H_0 about the data $\mathcal{Y}_n$ against H_1. We present a simple smoothed p-value test based on the Lebesgue measure of the subset of $\lambda's$ on which we reject H_0 based on $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, defined as the *P-Value Occupation Time* [PVOT]. In order to focus ideas, we ignore cases where λ may be a set, interval, or function, or infinite dimensional as in nonparametric estimation problems.

The PVOT has only been explored in Hill and Aguilar (2013) and Hill (2012) as a way to gain inference in the presence of a trimming tuning parameter. We extend the idea to test problems where λ is a nuisance parameter under H_1, and offer new applications to model specification tests. We also derive and compare for the first time global and local power.

Nuisance parameters under H_1 arise in two over-lapping cases. First, λ is part of the data generating process under H_1: $\mathcal{Y}_n$ has a joint distribution $f(y, \theta_0)$ for a unique point θ_0 under H_0, while under H_1 the distribution $f(y, \theta_0, \lambda)$ depends on some λ. This arises, for example, in ARMA models with common roots (Andrews and Cheng, 2012); tests of no GARCH effects (Engle, Lilien, and Robins, 1987, Andrews, 2001); tests for common factors (Andrews and Ploberger, 1996); tests for a Box-Cox transformation; and structural change tests (Andrews, 1993). A standard example is the regression $y_t = \beta_0' x_t + \gamma_0 h(\lambda, x_t) + \epsilon_t$ where x_t are covariates, and $E[\epsilon_t | x_t] = 0$ $a.s.$ for unique (β_0, γ_0). If $H_0 : \gamma_0 = 0$ is true then λ is not identified. See, e.g., Andrews and Ploberger (1994), Hansen (1996), Terasvirta (1994) and Andrews and Cheng (2012).

Second, λ is used to compute an estimator, or perform a general model specification test, hence we can only say $\mathcal{Y}_n$ has the joint distribution $f(y, \theta_0)$ under H_0. This includes tests of omitted nonlinearity against general alternatives (Bierens, 1990, Bierens and Ploberger, 1997, Stinchcombe and White, 1998, Hill, 2008, 2013); and tests of marginal effects in models with mixed frequency data where λ is used to reduce regressor dimensionality (Ghysels, Santa-Clara, and Valkanov, 2004). An example is the regression $y_t = \beta_0' x_t + \epsilon_t$ where we want to test $H_0 : E[\epsilon_t | x_t] = 0$ $a.s.$ This is fundamentally different from the preceding example where $E[\epsilon_t | x_t] = 0$ $a.s.$ is assumed. A test statistic can be based on the fact $E[\epsilon_t F(\lambda' x_t)] \neq 0$ *if and only if* $E[\epsilon_t | x_t]$

$= 0$ $a.s.$ is false, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$ outside of a measure zero subset, provided $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is exponential (Bierens, 1990), logistic (White, 1989), or any real analytic non-polynomial (Stinchcombe and White, 1998), or multinomials of x_t (Bierens, 1982, Hill, 2013). Notice that λ need not be part of the data generating process since $E[y_t|x_t] = \beta_0' x_t + \gamma_0 F(\lambda' x_t)$ $a.s.$ may not be true under H_1, but it *may* be true which is why these cases overlap. See Sections 4-6 for examples.

The challenge of constructing valid tests in the presence of nuisance parameters under H_1 dates at least to Chernoff and Zacks (1964) for a sup-LM test and Davies (1977, 1987) for a sup-LR test. Recent contributions include Nyblom (1989), Andrews (1993), Dufour (1997), Andrews and Ploberger (1994, 1995), Hansen (1996), and Andrews and Cheng (2012, 2013, 2014). Nuisance parameters that are not identified under H_0 are either chosen at random, thereby sacrificing power (e.g. White, 1989); or $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ is smoothed over Λ, resulting in a non-standard limit distribution and in general the necessity of a bootstrap step (e.g. Chernoff and Zacks, 1964, Davies, 1977, Andrews and Ploberger, 1994). Examples of transforms are the average $\int_\Lambda \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ and supremum $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, where $\mu(\lambda)$ is an absolutely continuous probability measure (Chernoff and Zacks, 1964, Davies, 1977, Andrews and Ploberger, 1994). See below for a discussion of power optimality of these transforms.

We assume $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) \geq 0$, and that large values are indicative of H_1. Let $p_n(\lambda)$ be a p-value or asymptotic p-value based on $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$: $p_n(\lambda)$ may be based on a known limit distribution, or if the limit distribution is non-standard then a bootstrap or simulation method is assumed available for computing an asymptotically valid approximation to $p_n(\lambda)$ (e.g. Künsch, 1989, Hansen, 1996, Shao, 2010). Assume that $p_n(\lambda)$ is asymptotically correct for the nominal size, uniformly on Λ:

$$\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |P\left(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha | H_0\right) - \alpha| \to 0 \text{ for any } \alpha \in (0,1)\,. \tag{1}$$

If $p_n(\lambda)$ is uniformly distributed then α is the size of the test, else by (1) α is the asymptotic size. The terms "asymptotic p-value" and "asymptotic size" are correct when convergence in (1) is uniform over H_0. The latter is not possible here because we do not specify a model or H_0 for greatest generality. If $p_n(\lambda)$ is asymptotically free of any other nuisance parameters then H_0 is otherwise simple, and uniform convergence over the null is immediate given that (1) is uniform over Λ (see Hansen, 1996, p. 417). Since this problem is common, we will not focus on it, and

will simply call $p_n(\lambda)$ a "p-value" for brevity.

The p-value [PV] test at asymptotic size α for a chosen value of λ is based on (1):

$$\textbf{PV Test:} \text{ reject } H_0 \text{ if } p_n(\lambda) < \alpha, \text{ otherwise fail to reject } H_0. \tag{2}$$

Now assume Λ has unit Lebesgue measure $\int_\Lambda d\lambda = 1$, and compute the *p-value occupation time* [PVOT] of $p_n(\lambda)$ below the nominal test size $\alpha \in (0,1)$:

$$\textbf{PVOT:} \mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) \equiv \int_\Lambda I\left(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha\right) d\lambda, \tag{3}$$

where $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. If $\int_\Lambda d\lambda \neq 1$ then we use $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) \equiv \int_\Lambda I(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha) d\lambda / \int_\Lambda d\lambda$. $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha)$ is just the Lebesgue measure of the subset of $\lambda' s$ on which we reject H_0. Thus, a large occupation time in the rejection region asymptotically indicates H_0 is false.

As long as $\{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ converges weakly under H_0 to a stochastic process $\{\mathcal{T}(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$, and $\mathcal{T}(\lambda)$ has a continuous distribution for all λ outside a set of measure zero, then asymptotically $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha)$ has a mean α and the probability that $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha$ is not greater than α. Evidence against H_0 is therefore simply $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha$. Further, if asymptotically the PV test (2) rejects H_0 for all λ in a subset of Λ that has Lebesgue measure greater than α, then $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha$ asymptotically with probability one. The PVOT test at size α is then:

$$\textbf{PVOT Test}\text{: reject } H_0 \text{ if } \mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha, \text{ otherwise fail to reject } H_0. \tag{4}$$

These results are formally derived in Section 3. Thus, an asymptotic level α critical value upper bound is simply α, a huge simplification over transforms with non-standard asymptotic distributions, like $\int_\Lambda \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ and $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$. A numerical experiment discussed below, and a simulation study, suggest the asymptotic critical value is *identically* α for tests of omitted nonlinearity and GARCH effects. We may therefore expect that similar tests have this property, including tests of a one time change point, Box-Cox transform, common factors, and so on.

A p-value may not be convenient to compute, or an asymptotic theory for bootstrapping a p-value may not be available, or asymptotic uniform correctness (1) may fail to hold. All of these issues arise, for example, in estimation and inference when a parameter subset π is possibly not

identified (e.g. Andrews and Cheng, 2012, 2013). Note that π may be fundamentally different from the nuisance parameter λ: see Example 5.1 in Section 5, and see the supplemental material Hill (2015). Andrews and Cheng (2012) present a variety of possibly data dependent critical values $\hat{c}_{1-\alpha,n}(\lambda)$ that are robust to weak and non-identification in the sense of leading to correct asymptotic size under regularity conditions. As long as such a critical value is available, and (1) becomes $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}|P(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) > \hat{c}_{1-\alpha,n}(\lambda)|H_0) - \alpha| \to 0$, then we use a Test Statistic Occupation Time $\int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) > \hat{c}_{1-\alpha,n}(\lambda))d\lambda$.

Besides the ease of computation and interpretation, there are several major contributions afforded by the PVOT. First, although we focus on the PVOT test, in Section 2 we show the PVOT naturally arises as a measure of test optimality when λ is part of the true data generating process under H_1. We work with Andrews and Ploberger's (1994) weighted average local power of a test based on $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, where the average is computed over λ and a drift parameter. We show weighted average local power is a weighted average mean *generalized* PVOT, where the latter uses a measure based on the local alternative rather than Lebesgue measure, and the mean is over possible values of the sample draw. A test is therefore optimal if it has the greatest weighted average mean *generalized* PVOT. This is logical since a *sub*-optimal test must spend *less* time rejecting the null, measured over the nuisance parameter and local drift. Further, the *generalized* PVOT is exactly $\int_\Lambda I(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda$ when the measure is evaluated under the null and Lebesgue measure is used on Λ. Thus, the PVOT is just a point estimate of the weighted average probability of PV test rejection evaluated under H_0. Since that probability is asymptotically no larger than α when the null is true, the PVOT test rejects H_0 when the PVOT is larger than α. See Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 2.2. Thus, the PVOT is a natural way to transform a test statistic in order to gain inference about the verity of a null hypothesis.

Second, since the PVOT critical value upper bound is simply α under any asymptotic theory for $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, we only require $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ to have a known or bootstrappable limit distribution, hence $\sqrt{n}$-Gaussian asymptotics is not required as is nearly always assumed (e.g. Andrews and Ploberger, 1994, Hansen, 1996, Andrews and Cheng, 2012). Non-standard asymptotics are therefore allowed, including test statistics when a parameter is weakly identified (e.g. Andrews and Cheng, 2012), GARCH tests (e.g. Andrews, 2001), and inference under heavy tails (e.g. Linton and Xiao, 2013); and non-$\sqrt{n}$ asymptotics are covered, as in heavy tail robust tests (e.g. Hill and Aguilar, 2013,

Aguilar and Hill, 2015, Hill, 2012), or when infill asymptotics or nonparametric estimators are involved (e.g. Nadaraya, 1964, Bandi and Phillips, 2007).

Third, in Section 4 we derive asymptotic local power for a PVOT test in the general case when $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) = h(\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda))$ for some measurable mapping $h(x)$ that is monotonically increasing in $|x|$, and some observed process $\{\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ that has a zero mean weak limit process. We then use a numerical exercise to show that asymptotic local power for PVOT, supremum and average versions of Bierens' (1990) test of omitted nonlinearity are virtually identical, and PVOT asymptotic size is exactly α when α is the critical value. Since $\int_\Lambda \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ is a limit of Andrews and Ploberger's (1994) power optimal weighted average exponential test, the PVOT test achieves local power on par with an optimal test. In view of the general result, the local power merits of the PVOT test appear to extend to any consistent test on Λ, but any such claim requires a specific test statistic and numerical exercise to verify.

Asymptotic global power of the PVOT test relies on PV test asymptotic power on a subset of Λ. If a level α PV test is consistent on a subset of Λ with measure $\beta \in (0, 1]$ then the PVOT test is consistent provided $\alpha \leq \beta$. By comparison, $\int_\Lambda \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ and $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ are consistent if $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ is consistent on a subset of Λ with positive measure. The requirements for PVOT test power are therefore more stringent than for average and supremum transforms, but it seems difficult to find a test in practice in which this is an issue, outside of an ad hoc toy example (see Example 3.3 in Section 3). Indeed, Andrews' (1993, 2001) structural change and GARCH tests are consistent on known compact sets Λ; and White (1989), Bierens (1990) and Bierens and Ploberger (1997) tests of omitted nonlinearity (amongst many others) are consistent on any compact Λ, hence PVOT versions are these tests are also consistent.

The PVOT is generally not invariant to measurable transformations $g(\lambda)$ in the sense that $\int_\Lambda I(p_n(g(\lambda)) < \alpha)d\lambda \neq \int_\Lambda I(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda$ for finite n. This is trivial because the rejection sets $\{\lambda \in \Lambda | p_n(\lambda) < \alpha\}$ and $\{\lambda \in \Lambda | p_n(g(\lambda)) < \alpha\}$ can have different Lebesgue measure. Further, $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha)$ naturally depends on Λ in cases where any compact set Λ can be used, including tests of omitted nonlinearity (Bierens, 1990, Bierens and Ploberger, 1997). Both problems, though, are pervasive in the literature on test statistic transformations when there is a nuisance parameter under H_1. See, e.g., Bierens and Wang (2012) who smooth Bierens and Ploberger's (1997) integrated conditional moment statistic over various $\Lambda's$. In some cases Λ is known, including a

test of no GARCH effects or no structural breaks where $\Lambda = [0, 1]$ (Andrews, 1993, 2001).

The PVOT smooths $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, hence it carries any invariance properties of the test statistic to reparameterizations and equivalent representations of H_0 (Dagenais and Dufour, 1991). Thus, with respect to invariance under transformations of H_0 or of λ, the PVOT ranks on par with existing test statistic transforms, e.g. Davies (1977) and Andrews and Ploberger (1994).

Andrews and Ploberger (1994) characterize the optimality properties of smoothed exponential Wald, LM or LR statistics in a likelihood setting, where λ is part of the true data generating process under H_1. The weighted average exp-$\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ has the highest weighted average power in the class of tests with asymptotic significance level α, and $\int_\Lambda \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ is a limiting case when power is directed toward alternatives infinitesimally close to H_0. The supremum $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, however, is not optimal because it directs power beyond the permissible boundary of a parameter in their test statistic, although the sup-LR test is optimal when $n \to \infty$ and the level $\alpha \to 0$ (Davies, 1977).

Andrews and Cheng (2012) deliver methods of inference robust to any degree of identification, using high level assumptions. Consult that source for references. Their methods are for parametric models where λ is part of the data generating process, and they require $\sqrt{n}$-Gaussian asymptotics. They estimate all parameters, hence the estimated λ is a *random* nuisance parameter. A different technique is required when λ is not part of the data generating (e.g. test of omitted nonlinearity with a general alternative), or not estimated (e.g. test of omitted nonlinearity, GARCH test). Standard asymptotics neglects slower convergence rates, including heavy tail robust inference, tail inference, nonparametric estimators, and infill asymptotics. Finally, Gaussian asymptotics neglects inference for processes with (near) unit roots (e.g. Phillips and Perron, 1989), and heavy tailed data, to name a few cases. The PVOT test allows for both nuisance parameters under the alternative, *and* weakly or non-identified parameters by combining our methods with those of Andrews and Cheng (2012); and it does not require $\sqrt{n}$-Gaussian asymptotics since it only requires weak convergence of $\{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\}$ and a computable p-value or critical value. Although allowing for random nuisance parameters in a general setting seems feasible (e.g. Pfanzagl, 1993), the topic is beyond the scope of the present paper.

Other works include King and Shively (1993) whose re-parameterization leads to a conventional test, but it is not general and may not apply to some problems (see King and Shively, 1993,

p. 2). Hansen (1996) presents a wild bootstrap for computing the p-value for a smoothed LM statistic when λ is part of the data generating process. The method can be generalized to other settings, but is computationally intensive. See Shao (2010) for a dependent wild bootstrap. Our simulation study for tests of functional form and GARCH effects shows the PVOT test performs on par with the ave-test and dominates the sup-test, both with bootstrapped p-values.

Bierens (1990) compares supremum and pointwise statistics to achieve standard asymptotics for a functional form test. Bierens and Ploberger (1997) similarly compute a critical value upper bound. We show that the upper bound leads to an under-sized test and potentially low power in a local power numerical exercise and a simulation study.

In Section 2 we show how the PVOT plays a key role in measuring power. We present the formal list of assumptions and the main results for the PVOT test in Section 3. Local power is characterized in Section 4 in general, and for a test of omitted nonlinearity. Examples are given in Section 5, and in Section 6 we give broad details and asymptotic theory for a PVOT test of GARCH affects. In Section 7 we perform a simulation study involving tests of functional form and GARCH effects. Concluding remarks are left for Section 8, and proofs are in the Appendix.

2 PVOT as a Measure of Power and Test Optimality

We work in Andrews and Ploberger's (1994) likelihood framework. Let $\mathcal{Y}_n \equiv [y_1, ..., y_n]'$ be an observed sample of variables $y_t \in \mathbb{R}^k$, with joint probability density $f(y, \theta_0, \lambda)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^{nk}$ and $\theta_0 = [\beta_0', \delta_0']' \in \mathbb{R}^s$ where $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^r, 0 < r \leq s$. If $\beta_0 = 0$ then the distribution $f(y, \theta_0)$ does not depend on λ. Assume $f(y, \theta, \lambda) > 0$ *almost everywhere* on $\mathbb{S} \times \Theta \times \Lambda$, for some subset $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{nk}$, Θ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^s$ containing θ_0, and $\int_\Lambda d\lambda = 1$ by convention.

We want to test $H_0 : \beta_0 = 0$ against $H_1 : \beta_0 \neq 0$, hence λ is part of the data generating process only under H_1. Consider a sequence of local alternatives H_1^L of the form $f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1} b, \lambda)$ where $\mathcal{N}_n = [\mathcal{N}_{i,j,n}]_{i,j=1}^s$ is a diagonal matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^s$, and $\mathcal{N}_{i,i,n} \to \infty$. Under regular asymptotics $\mathcal{N}_n = \sqrt{n} I_s$, but $\mathcal{N}_n$ may differ from $\sqrt{n} I_s$ if some variables are trending, or negligible trimming is used for possibly heavy tailed data (e.g. Hill and Aguilar, 2013).

Let $\xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, b, \lambda) \in \{0, 1\}$ be any asymptotic level α test of H_0 for some imputed (b, λ), and as in Andrews and Ploberger (1994) let J and Q_λ for each λ be continuous probability mea-

sures on Λ and $\mathbb{R}^s$ respectively. For example, the LR statistic is $\xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, b, \lambda) = I(f(\mathcal{Y}_n, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda)/f(\mathcal{Y}_n, \theta_0) > c_{n,\alpha}(b, \lambda))$ where $c_{n,\alpha}(b, \lambda)$ is the asymptotic level α critical value, hence $E[\xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, b, \lambda)] \to \alpha$ under H_0. Andrews and Ploberger (1994) require Q_λ to be a Gaussian density that depends on λ in order to show that their exp-LM statistic is optimal amongst smoothed test statistics. We allow Q_λ to depend on λ merely for generality, since it is not imperative for showing how the PVOT relates to weighted average power.[1]

A test of H_0 against the sequence of simple alternatives $\{f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) : (b, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^s \times \Lambda\}_{n\geq 1}$ has weighted average local power (cf. Andrews and Ploberger, 1994)

$$\int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{nk}} \xi(y, b, \lambda) f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) dy \right] dQ_\lambda(b) dJ(\lambda).$$

Now let $g(y)$ be any joint probability measure that is positive on $\mathbb{R}^{nk}$ *a.e.*, define the expectations operator $E_g[\mathcal{Z}] \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nk}} z g(z) dz$, and define:

$$d\omega(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) \equiv \frac{f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda)}{g(y)} dQ_\lambda(b) dJ(\lambda).$$

In general we do not require $d\omega(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda)$ to be a probability measure, although it will be for an obvious choice of $g(y)$ discussed below. By Fubini's Theorem, and the construction of the weight $d\omega$ and expectations operator E_g:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{nk}} \xi(y, b, \lambda) f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) dy \right] dQ_\lambda(b) dJ(\lambda) \\
&\qquad = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nk}} \left[\int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} \xi(y, b, \lambda) \frac{f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda)}{g(y)} dQ_\lambda(b) dJ(\lambda) \right] g(y) dy \\
&\qquad = E_g \left[\int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} \xi(y, b, \lambda) d\omega(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We will call the above integral under expectations,

$$\mathcal{P}_\xi^{(\omega)}(\mathcal{Y}_n) \equiv \int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} \xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, b, \lambda) d\omega(\mathcal{Y}_n, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda), \tag{5}$$

[1] Andrews and Ploberger (1994) fix $Q_\lambda(b) = N(0, c\Sigma_\lambda)$ for some constant $c > 0$ that guides weight toward certain alternatives, and a covariance matrix Σ_λ that depends on λ, cf. Wald (1943). They also use Lebesgue measure J for the weight on Λ in their simulations as a default tactic when information about the true λ under H_1 is not available.

the ω-PVOT since it gives the ω measure of the subset of $\mathbb{R}^s \times \Lambda$ on which a test based on $\xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, b, \lambda)$ rejects H_0 in favor of $f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda)$. Weighted average local power can therefore be represented as a mean ω-PVOT:

$$\int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{nk}} \xi(y, b, \lambda) f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) dy \right] dQ_\lambda(b) dJ(\lambda) = E_g \left[\mathcal{P}_\xi^{(\omega)}(\mathcal{Y}_n) \right]. \tag{6}$$

The ω-PVOT provides a natural way to rank tests: a test is optimal, in the sense of having the highest weighted average local power for given probability measures (J, Q_λ), *if and only if* it has the highest mean ω-PVOT. This seems natural since an optimal test should spend the most time in the rejection region, over the nuisance parameter λ and local drift b.

As a special case, the probability measure

$$g(y) = \int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}\tilde{b}, \tilde{\lambda}) dQ_\lambda(\tilde{b}) dJ(\tilde{\lambda}) \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^{nk} \tag{7}$$

yields a probability measure $d\omega$ on $\mathbb{R}^s \times \Lambda$ for each y:

$$d\omega(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) = \frac{f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) dQ_\lambda(b) dJ(\lambda)}{\int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}\tilde{b}, \tilde{\lambda}) dQ_\lambda(\tilde{b}) dJ(\tilde{\lambda})}. \tag{8}$$

If we define an expectations operator $E_{f_n(b,\lambda)}[\mathcal{Z}] \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nk}} z f(z, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) dz$, then (8) and Fubini's Theorem yield:

$$\begin{aligned} E_g \left[\mathcal{P}_\xi^{(\omega)}(\mathcal{Y}_n) \right] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nk}} \mathcal{P}_\xi^{(\omega)}(y) \left[\int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) dQ_\lambda(b) dJ(\lambda) \right] dy \\ &= \int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{nk}} \mathcal{P}_\xi^{(\omega)}(y) f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) dy \right] dQ_\lambda(b) dJ(\lambda) \\ &= \int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} E_{f_n(b,\lambda)} \left[\mathcal{P}_\xi^{(\omega)}(\mathcal{Y}_n) \right] dQ_\lambda(b) dJ(\lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Combine (6)-(9) to deduce weighted average local power can be represented as a weighted average mean ω-PVOT, where the mean is with respect to the alternative density $f(z, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda)$. The above conclusions are summarized in the next result.

Proposition 2.1 *Weighted average local power of a test of* $H_0 : \beta_0 = 0$ *against* $\{f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) : (b, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^s \times \Lambda\}_{n \geq 1}$ *is a mean* ω*-PVOT. Under density (8) weighted average local*

power is a weighted average mean ω-PVOT (9), where the mean is with respect to the alternative density $f(z, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda)$.

Remark 1 By the Neyman-Pearson Lemma and Proposition 2.1, the LR test has the highest weighted average mean ω-PVOT amongst asymptotic level α tests of H_0 against the sequence of simple alternatives $\{f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) : (b, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^s \times \Lambda\}_{n\geq 1}$. The result carries over to Wald and LM tests by asymptotic equivalence with the LR test.

Remark 2 The LR test must be of the form $I(f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda)/f(y, \theta_0) > c_{n,\alpha}(b, \lambda))$ in order to rewrite weighted average power in terms of the ω-PVOT, hence we are restricted to testing H_0 against the sequence of alternatives $\{f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) : (b, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^s \times \Lambda\}_{n\geq 1}$. Evidently there does not exist a comparable result showing PVOT optimality of the smoothed LR test $\xi(\mathcal{Y}_n) \equiv I(\int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda) dQ_\lambda(b) dJ(\lambda)/f(y, \theta_0) > c_{n,\alpha})$ of H_0 against the sequence of local alternatives $\{\int_\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} f(y, \theta_0 + \mathcal{N}_n^{-1}b, \lambda)/f(y, \theta_0) dQ_\lambda(b) dJ(\lambda)\}_{n\geq 1}$. Logically, we cannot obtain a PVOT on Λ for a smoothed test statistic like $\xi(\mathcal{Y}_n)$, as well as average and supremum statistics: the PVOT is a fundamental entity for measuring the power of test statistics that are not smoothed on Λ, precisely by measuring how often the non-smoothed PV test rejects on Λ. By comparison, Andrews and Ploberger (1994) only treat test statistics like $\xi(\mathcal{Y}_n) \in \{0, 1\}$ which involve presmoothing over the nuisance parameter λ and drift b.

The PVOT (3) used as a test statistic obviously does not average over local alternatives, so consider a level α test $\xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda) \in \{0, 1\}$ of $H_0 : \beta_0 = 0$ against global alternatives $\{f(y, \theta_1, \lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$. The LR statistic, for example, is $\xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda) = I(f(\mathcal{Y}_n, \theta_1, \lambda)/f(\mathcal{Y}_n, \theta_0) > c_{n,\alpha}(\lambda))$. Weighted average power is simply $\int_\Lambda [\int_{\mathbb{R}^{nk}} \xi(y, \lambda) f(y, \theta_1, \lambda) dy] dJ(\lambda)$.

Define the operator $E_{f(\theta_1,\lambda)}[\mathcal{Z}] \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nk}} z f(z, \theta_1, \lambda) dz$, and define a ω-PVOT $\mathcal{P}_\xi^{(\omega)}(\mathcal{Y}_n) \equiv \int_\Lambda \xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda) d\omega(\mathcal{Y}_n, \theta_1, \lambda)$. If the probability measure in (7) is now $g(y) = \int_\Lambda f(y, \theta_1, \lambda) dJ(\lambda)$, then $d\omega(y, \theta_1, \lambda) = f(y, \theta_1, \lambda) dJ(\lambda)/(\int_\Lambda f(y, \theta_1, \tilde{\lambda}) dJ(\tilde{\lambda}))$ and we obtain the following result.

Corollary 2.2 *Weighted average power of a test of H_0 against the simple alternative $f(y, \theta_1, \lambda)$ is identically $\int_\Lambda E_{f(\theta_1,\lambda)}[\mathcal{P}_\xi^{(\omega)}(\mathcal{Y}_n)] dJ(\lambda)$, the weighted average mean ω-PVOT, where the mean is evaluated under H_1.*

Now use Lebesgue measure $J(\lambda)$ on Λ, as in Andrews and Ploberger (1994, pp. 1384, 1395, 1398), and evaluate the joint density $f(y, \theta_1, \lambda)$ under the null $\theta_1 = \theta_0$ to yield $d\omega(y, \theta_0, \lambda) = dJ(\lambda) = d\lambda$. The ω-PVOT now reduces to

$$\mathcal{P}_{\xi}^{(\omega)}(\mathcal{Y}_n) = \int_{\Lambda} \xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda) d\lambda,$$

which is simply PVOT (3). Power under the null, of course, is trivial: by construction $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{nk}} \xi(y, \lambda) f(y, \theta_0) dy = P(\xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda) = 1) = P(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha) \to \alpha$, hence by Fubini's Theorem and bounded convergence $\int_{\Lambda} E_{f(\theta_1, \lambda)}[\mathcal{P}_{\xi}^{(\omega)}(\mathcal{Y}_n)] dJ(\lambda) \to \alpha$.

This reveals that the PVOT $\int_{\Lambda} \xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda) d\lambda$ as in (3) is just the power relevant ω-PVOT evaluated under the null with Lebesgue measure. Thus, PVOT $\int_{\Lambda} \xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda) d\lambda$ is simply a point estimate of the PV test weighted average probability of rejection, identically $\int_{\Lambda} E_{f(\theta_1, \lambda)}[\mathcal{P}_{\xi}^{(\omega)}(\mathcal{Y}_n)] dJ(\lambda)$, evaluated under H_0. This probability is no larger than α when H_0 is true, hence if the PVOT $\int_{\Lambda} \xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda) d\lambda \leq \alpha$ then we have evidence that either H_0 is correct, or global power is trivial. Conversely, $\int_{\Lambda} \xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda) d\lambda > \alpha$ for a given sample provides evidence in favor of H_1 *and* suggests global power of the PV test is non-trivial. Finally, we show below that the PVOT test is consistent if the PV test is consistent on a subset of Λ with measure greater than α, in which case, $\int_{\Lambda} \xi(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda) d\lambda \leq \alpha$ only suggests the null is true.

3 Asymptotic Theory

The following notation is used. $[z]$ rounds z to the nearest integer. $a_n/b_n \sim c$ implies $a_n/b_n \to c$ as $n \to \infty$. $|\cdot|$ is the l_1-matrix norm, and $||\cdot||$ is the Euclidean norm, unless otherwise noted. $l_{\infty}(\Lambda)$ is the space of bounded functions on Λ.

We require a notion of weak convergence that can handle a range of applications. A fundamental concern is that the mapping $\mathcal{T}_n : \Lambda \to [0, \infty)$ is not here defined, making measurability of $\{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ and related transforms like $\int_{\Lambda} I(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha) d\lambda$ and $\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ a challenge. We therefore assume all random variables in this paper exist on a complete measure space such that majorants and integrals are measurable, and probabilities where applicable are outer probability measures. See Pollard's (1984: Appendix C) permissibility criteria, and see Dudley (1978).

We use weak convergence in the sense of Hoffman-Jϕrgensen (1991), denoted:

$$\{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\} \Rightarrow^* \{\mathcal{T}(\lambda)\} \text{ in } l_\infty(\Lambda), \text{ where } \{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\} = \{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}, \text{ etc.}$$

If, for instance, the data sample is $\mathcal{Y}_n \equiv \{y_t\}_{t=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{nk}$, and $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ is a measurable mapping $h(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{Y}_n, \lambda))$ of a function $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbb{R}^{nk} \times \Lambda$, then $h(\mathcal{Z}(y, \lambda)) \in l_\infty(\Lambda)$ requires the uniform bound $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |h(\mathcal{Z}(y, \lambda))| < \infty$ for each $y \in \mathbb{R}^{nk}$.[2] Sufficient conditions for weak convergence to a Gaussian process, for example, are convergence in finite dimensional distributions, and stochastic equicontinuity: $\forall \epsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\sup_{||\lambda-\tilde{\lambda}||\leq\delta} |\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) - \mathcal{T}_n(\tilde{\lambda})| > \eta) < \epsilon$. A "version" of $\{\mathcal{T}(\lambda)\}$ is a process with the same finite dimensional joint distributions. Consult, e.g., Dudley (1978), Gine and Zinn (1984), and Pollard (1984).

A large variety of test statistics are known to converge weakly under regularity conditions. In many cases $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ is a continuous function $h(\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda))$ of a sequence of sample mappings $\{\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda)\}_{n\geq 1}$ such that $\sup_{x\in A} |h(x)| < \infty$ on every compact subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, and $\{\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda)\} \Rightarrow^* \{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\}$ a Gaussian process. Two examples of h are $h(x) = x^2$ for asymptotic chi-squared tests of functional form or structural change; or $h(x) = \max\{0, x\}$ for a GARCH test (Andrews, 2001). If $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\}$ is Gaussian, then any other Gaussian process with the same mean $E[\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)]$ and covariance kernel $E[\mathcal{Z}(\lambda_1)\mathcal{Z}(\lambda_2)]$ is a version of $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\}$. Even in the Gaussian case it is not true that all versions have continuous sample paths, but if a version of $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\}$ has continuous paths then this is enough to apply a continuous mapping theorem to $\{\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda)\}$. See Dudley (1967, 1978).

Assumption 1 (weak convergence) *Let H_0 be true.*
a. $\{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\} \Rightarrow^* \{\mathcal{T}(\lambda)\}$*, a process with a version that has* almost surely *uniformly continuous sample paths (with respect to some norm $||\cdot||$). $\mathcal{T}(\lambda) \geq 0$ a.s., $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{T}(\lambda) < \infty$ a.s., and $\mathcal{T}(\lambda)$ has an absolutely continuous distribution for all $\lambda \in \Lambda/S$ where S has Lebesgue measure zero.*
b. $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |p_n(\lambda) - \bar{F}_0(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda))| \xrightarrow{p} 0$*, where* $\bar{F}_0(c) \equiv P(\mathcal{T}(\lambda) > c)$.

Remark 3 Condition (a) is broadly applicable, while continuity of the distribution of $\mathcal{T}(\lambda)$ and (b) ensure $p_n(\lambda)$ has asymptotically a uniform limit distribution under H_0. This is mild since often $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ is a continuous transformation of a standardized sample analogue to a population

[2]If more details are available, then boundedness can be refined. For example, if $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) = (1/\sqrt{n}\sum_{t=1}^2 z(y_t, \lambda))^2$ where $z : \mathbb{R} \times \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$, then we need $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |z(y, \lambda)| < \infty$ for each y.

moment. In a great variety of settings for stationary processes, for example, a standardized sample moment has a Gaussian or stable distribution limit, or converges to a function of a Gaussian or stable process. See Gine and Zinn (1984) and Pollard (1984) for weak convergence to stochastic processes, exemplified with Gaussian functional asymptotics, and see Bartkiewicz, Jakubowski, Mikosch, and Wintenberger (2010) for weak convergence to a Stable process for a (possibly dependent) heavy tailed process. Condition (b) is required when $p_n(\lambda)$ is not computed as the asymptotic p-value $\bar{F}_0(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda))$, for example when a simulation or bootstrap method is used. If (b) does not or is not known to hold for reasons discussed in Section 1, then we implicitly assume a critical value $\hat{c}_{1-\alpha,n}(\lambda)$ exists such that $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}|P(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) > \hat{c}_{1-\alpha,n}(\lambda)|H_0) - \alpha| \to 0$, in which case the Test Statistic Occupation Time is used. We work only under (b) for brevity.

Under H_0 there is asymptotically a probability α we reject at any λ, hence asymptotically no more than an α portion of all $\lambda's$ lead to a rejection. All proofs are presented in Appendix A.

Theorem 3.1 *Under Assumption 1, if H_0 is true then $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha) \leq \alpha$. Moreover, as long as $\{\mathcal{T}(\lambda)\}$ is weakly dependent in the sense that $P(\bar{F}_0(\mathcal{T}(\lambda)) < \alpha, \bar{F}_0(\mathcal{T}(\tilde{\lambda})) < \alpha) > \alpha^2$ on a subset of $\Lambda \times \Lambda$ with positive measure, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha) > 0$.*

Remark 4 The proof reveals polemic cases: (i) if every h-tuple $\{\mathcal{T}(\lambda_1), ..., \mathcal{T}(\lambda_h)\}$ of the limit process is jointly *independent*, $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j \; \forall i \neq j$, then the PVOT $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) \xrightarrow{d} \alpha$ hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha) = 0$ so that the PVOT has a degenerate limit distribution; or (ii) if $\mathcal{T}(\lambda) = \mathcal{T}(\lambda^*)$ *a.s.* for some λ^* and all λ such that they are perfectly *dependent*, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha) = \alpha$ and the asymptotic size is α. Neither case seems plausible in practice, although (ii) occurs when λ is a tuning parameter since these do not appear in the limit process (see Hill and Aguilar, 2013). Case (i) is logical since $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) \xrightarrow{d} \int_\Lambda I(\bar{F}_0(\mathcal{T}(\lambda)) < \alpha)d\lambda$, while $\int_\Lambda I(\bar{F}_0(\mathcal{T}(\lambda)) < \alpha)d\lambda$ has mean α and is just a limiting Riemann sum of bounded independent random variables, hence it has a zero variance by dominated convergence. As long as $\mathcal{T}(\lambda)$ is weakly dependent across λ then $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha) > 0$, ruling out (i). An example is $\mathcal{T}(\lambda) = \mathcal{Z}(\lambda)^2$ where $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\}$ is a Gaussian process with unit variance and covariance kernel $E[\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\mathcal{Z}(\tilde{\lambda})]$ that is continuous in $(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda})$ All tests discussed in this paper have weakly dependent $\mathcal{T}(\lambda)$ under standard regularity conditions.

Next, asymptotic global power of PV test (2) translates to global power for PVOT test (4).

Theorem 3.2 *Let Assumption 1 hold, and let H_1 be true.*
a. $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha) > 0$ if and only if $p_n(\lambda) < \alpha$ *on a subset of* Λ *with Lebesgue measure* greater *than* α *asymptotically with positive probability.*
b. The PVOT test is consistent $P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha) \to 1$ *if the PV test is consistent* $P(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha) \to 1$ *on a subset of* Λ *with measure greater than* α.

Remark 5 As long as the PV test is consistent on a subset of Λ with measure greater than α, then the PVOT test is consistent. This trivially holds when the PV test is consistent for any λ outside a set with measure zero, including Andrews' (2001) GARCH test which is consistent on a known compact Λ; White (1989), Bierens (1990) and Bierens and Ploberger (1997) tests (and others) of omitted nonlinearity which are consistent on any compact Λ; and a test of an omitted Box-Cox transformation. See also Examples 4.2 and 5.3 in Section 5, and Section 6. A randomized test where $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ is evaluated at an uniform draw $\lambda_* \in \Lambda$ independent of the data: the randomized test is consistent only if the PV test is consistent for every λ outside a set with measure zero. The transforms $\int_\Lambda \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ and $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, however, are consistent if the PV test is consistent on a subset of Λ with positive measure. Thus, the PVOT test ranks above the randomized test, but below average and supremum tests in terms of required PV test asymptotic power over Λ. As we discussed in Section 1, it is difficult to find a relevant example in which this matters, outside a toy example. We give such an example below.

The following shows how PV test power transfers to the PVOT test.

Example 3.3 Let λ_* be a random draw from a uniform distribution on Λ. The parameter space is $\Lambda = [0, 1]$, $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) \xrightarrow{p} \infty$ for $\lambda \in [.5, .56]$ such that the PV test is consistent on a subset with measure $\beta = .06$, and $\{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda/[.5, .56]\} \Rightarrow^* \{\mathcal{T}(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda/[.5, .56]\}$ such that there is only trivial power. Thus, $\int_\Lambda \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ and $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ have asymptotic power of one. A uniformly randomized PV test is not consistent at any level, and at level $\alpha < .06$ has trivial power.

In the PVOT case, however, by applying arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we can show $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha)$ is identically

$$P\left(\int_{\lambda\in[.5,.56]} d\lambda + \int_{\lambda\notin[.5,.56]} I\left(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha\right) d\lambda > \alpha\right) = P\left(\int_{\lambda\notin[.5,.56]} I\left(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha\right) d\lambda > \alpha - .06\right)$$

for some process $\{\mathcal{U}(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda/[.5, .56]\}$ where $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ is uniform on $[0, 1]$. This implies the PVOT test is consistent for a test at level $\alpha \leq .06$ since $\int_{\lambda \notin [.5,.56]} I(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha) d\lambda > 0$ $a.s.$

4 Local Power

A characterization of local power requires an explicit hypothesis and some information on the construction of $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$. Assume an observed sequence $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^n$ has a parametric joint distribution $f(y; \theta_0)$, where $\theta_0 = [\beta_0', \delta_0',]$ and $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^r$, $r \geq 1$. Consider testing whether the subvector $\beta_0 = 0$, while δ_0 may contain other distribution parameters. If some additional parameter λ is part of δ_0 only when $\beta_0 \neq 0$, and therefore not identified under H_0, then we have Andrews and Ploberger's (1994) setting, but in general λ need not be part of the true data generating process.

We first treat a general environment. We then study a test of omitted nonlinearity, and perform a numerical experiment in order to compare local power.

4.1 Local Power : General Case

The sequence of local alternatives we consider is similar to the form in Section 2:

$$H_1^L : \beta_0 = \mathcal{N}_n^{-1} b \text{ for some } (\beta_0, b) \in \mathbb{R}^r, \tag{10}$$

where $(\mathcal{N}_n\}$ is a sequence of diagonal matrices $[\mathcal{N}_{n,i,j}]_{i,j=1}^r$, $\mathcal{N}_{n,i,i} \to \infty$. The test statistic is $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ $\equiv h(\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda))$ for a sequence of random functions $\{\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda)\}$ on $\mathbb{R}^q$, $q \geq 1$, and measurable function $h : \mathbb{R}^q \to [0, \infty)$ where $h(x)$ is monotonically increasing in $||x||$, and $h(x) \to \infty$ as $||x|| \to \infty$. An example is a Wald statistic, e.g. for a test of a one time structural change, where $\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda)$ is $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_n^{-1/2}(\lambda)\mathcal{N}_n\hat{\beta}_n(\lambda)$, a standardized estimator of β_0 for some positive definite $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_n(\lambda)$ with positive definite uniform probability limit $\mathcal{V}(\lambda)$, hence $q = r$, and $h(x) = x'x$. See Example 5.3 below.

We assume regularity conditions apply such that under H_1^L

$$\{\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \Rightarrow^* \{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda) + c(\lambda)b : \lambda \in \Lambda\}, \tag{11}$$

for some matrix $c(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, and $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\}$ is a zero mean process with a version that has *almost*

surely uniformly continuous sample paths (with respect to some norm $||\cdot||$). In the Wald statistic example $c(\lambda)$ is simply $\mathcal{V}^{-1/2}(\lambda)$ under standard asymptotics. In many cases in the literature $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\}$ is a Gaussian process with $E[\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)'] = I_q$.

Combine (11) and the continuous mapping theorem to deduce under H_0 the limiting distribution function $F_0(x) \equiv P(h(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)) \leq x)$ for $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$. An asymptotic p-value is $p_n(\lambda) = \bar{F}_0(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda))$ $\equiv 1 - F_0(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda))$, hence $\int_\Lambda I(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda \xrightarrow{d} \int_\Lambda I(\bar{F}_0(h(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)) + c(\lambda)b)) < \alpha)$ under H_1^L. Similarly, any continuous mapping g over Λ satisfies $g(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)) \xrightarrow{d} g(h(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda) + c(\lambda)b))$, including $\int_\Lambda \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ and $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$. Obviously if $c(\lambda)b = 0$ when $b \neq 0$ then local power is trivial at λ. Whether any of the above tests has non-trivial asymptotic local power depends on the measure of the subset of Λ on which $\inf_{\xi'\xi=1} \xi' c(\lambda)\xi > 0$.

In order to make a fair comparison across tests, we assume each is asymptotically correctly sized for a level α test. The next result follows from the preceding properties, hence a proof is omitted.

Theorem 4.1 *Let (10), (11) and $b \neq 0$ hold, and write $\mathcal{C}(\lambda) \equiv \inf_{\xi'\xi=1} \xi' c(\lambda)\xi$. Assume the randomized statistic $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda^*)$ uses a draw λ^* from a uniform distribution on Λ. Asymptotic local power is non-trivial for (i) the PVOT test when $\mathcal{C}(\lambda) > 0$ on a subset of Λ with measure greater than α; and (ii) the uniformly randomized, average and supremum tests when $\mathcal{C}(\lambda) > 0$ on a subset of Λ with positive measure.*
b. Under cases (i) and (ii), asymptotic local power is monotonically increasing in $|b|$ and converges to one as $|b| \to \infty$.

Remark 6 The PVOT test ranks lower than randomized, average and supremum tests because it rejects only when the PV tests rejects on a subset of Λ with measure greater than α. Indeed, the PVOT test cannot asymptotically distinguish between PV tests that are consistent on a subset with measure less than α and have trivial power otherwise, or have trivial power everywhere. This cost is slight since a meaningful example in which it matters, aside from the simple Example 3.3, is difficult to find. The tests of omitted nonlinearity, one time structural break, GARCH effects, and omitted Box-Cox transformation in Sections 4.2, 5 and 6 have randomized, PVOT, average and supremum versions with non-trivial local power, although we only give complete details for a test of omitted nonlinearity.

4.2 Example : Test of Omitted Nonlinearity

The proposed model to be tested is

$$y_t = f\left(x_t, \zeta_0\right) + e_t,$$

where ζ_0 lies in the interior of $\mathfrak{Z}$, a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^q$, $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^k$ contains a constant term and may contain lags of y_t, and $f : \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathfrak{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a known response function. Assume $\{e_t, x_t, y_t\}$ are stationary for simplicity. Let Ψ be a 1-1 bounded mapping from $\mathbb{R}^k$ to $\mathbb{R}^k$, let $\mathcal{F} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be analytic and non-polynomial (e.g. exponential or logistic), and assume $\lambda \in \Lambda$, a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$. Misspecification $\sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^q} P(E[y_t|x_t] = f(x_t, \zeta)) < 1$ implies $E[e_t \mathcal{F}(\lambda' \Psi(x_t))] \neq 0 \; \forall \lambda \in \Lambda / \mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{S}$ has Lebesgue measure zero. See Bierens (1990), Bierens and Ploberger (1997) and Stinchcombe and White (1998) for seminal results for iid data. The test statistic for a test of the hypothesis $H_0 : E[y_t|x_t] = f(x_t, \zeta_0)$ *a.s.* is

$$\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) = \left(\frac{1}{\hat{v}_n(\lambda)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^{n} e_t(\hat{\zeta}_n) \mathcal{F}\left(\lambda' \Psi(x_t)\right) \right)^2 \text{ where } e_t(\zeta) \equiv y_t - f(x_t, \zeta). \tag{12}$$

The estimator $\hat{\zeta}_n$ is $\sqrt{n}$-consistent of a strongly identified ζ_0, and $\hat{v}_n^2(\lambda)$ is a consistent estimator of $E[\{1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{t=1}^n e_t(\hat{\zeta}_n) \mathcal{F}(\lambda' \Psi(x_t))\}^2]$. By application of Theorem S.1.1 in the supplemental material Hill (2015), the asymptotic p-value is $p_n(\lambda) \equiv 1 - F_1\left(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\right)$ where F_1 is the $\chi^2(1)$ distribution function.

The test is asymptotically equivalent to a score test of $H_0 : \beta_0 = 0$ in the model $y_t = f\left(x_t, \zeta_0\right) + \beta_0 \mathcal{F}\left(\lambda' \Psi(x_t)\right) + \epsilon_t$. In view of $\sqrt{n}$-asymptotics, a sequence of local-to-null alternatives is $H_1^L : \beta_0 = b/\sqrt{n}$ for some $b \in \mathbb{R}$. We assume regularity conditions apply such that, for some sequence of positive finite non-random numbers $\{c(\lambda)\}$:

$$\text{under } H_1^L : \; \{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\} \Rightarrow^* \left\{ \left(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda) + c(\lambda) b\right)^2 : \lambda \in \Lambda \right\}, \tag{13}$$

where $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda) + c(\lambda) b\}$ is a Gaussian process with mean $\{c(\lambda) b\}$, and *almost surely* uniformly continuous sample paths. See Section S.1 of the supplemental material Hill (2015) for low level assumptions that imply (13), where $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is a zero mean Gaussian process with a non-

zero continuous covariance kernel. The latter implies by Theorem 3.1 that the PVOT asymptotic probability of rejection $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha)$, under H_0, is between $(0, \alpha]$.

Let $F_{J,\nu}(c)$ denote a noncentral $\chi^2(J)$ law with noncentrality ν, hence $(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda) + c(\lambda)b)^2$ is distributed $F_{1,b^2c(\lambda)^2}$. Under the null $b = 0$ by construction $p_n(\lambda) \xrightarrow{d} \bar{F}_{1,0}((\mathcal{Z}(\lambda) + c(\lambda)b)^2)$ is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. Under the global alternative $\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{R}^q} P(E[y_t|x_t] = f(x_t, \zeta)) < 1$ notice $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) \xrightarrow{p} \infty \; \forall\lambda \in \Lambda/S$ implies $p_n(\lambda) \xrightarrow{p} 0 \; \forall\lambda \in \Lambda/S$, hence $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) \xrightarrow{p} 1$ by Theorem 3.2, which implies the PVOT test of $E[y_t|x_t] = f(x_t, \zeta_0)$ *a.s.* is consistent. Under the local alternative we achieve the next result.

Theorem 4.2 *Under (13), asymptotic local power of the PVOT test is* $P(\int_\Lambda I(\bar{F}_{1,0}(\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda) + c(\lambda)b\}^2) < \alpha)d\lambda > \alpha)$. *Hence, under* H_1^L *the probability the PVOT test rejects* H_0 *increases to unity monotonically as the drift parameter* $|b| \to \infty$, *for any nominal level* $\alpha \in [0, 1)$.

4.3 Numerical Experiment : Test of Omitted Nonlinearity

Our goal is to compare asymptotic local power for tests based on the PVOT, average $\int_\Lambda \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ with uniform measure $\mu(\lambda)$, supremum $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, and Bierens and Ploberger's (1997) Integrated Conditional Moment [ICM] statistics. We work with a simple model $y_t = \zeta_0 x_t + \beta_0 \exp\{\lambda x_t\} + \epsilon_t$, where $\zeta_0 = 1$, $\beta_0 = b/\sqrt{n}$, and $\{\epsilon_t, x_t\}$ are iid $N(0, 1)$ distributed. We omit a constant term entirely for simplicity. In order to abstract from the impact of sampling error on asymptotics, we assume $\zeta_0 = 1$ is known, hence the test statistic is

$$\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) \equiv \frac{\hat{z}_n^2(\lambda)}{\hat{v}_n^2(\lambda)} \text{ where } \hat{z}_n(\lambda) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n (y_t - \zeta_0 x_t) \exp\{\lambda x_t\}, \; \hat{v}_n^2(\lambda) \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (y_t - \zeta_0 x_t)^2 \exp\{2\lambda x_t\}.$$

The nuisance parameter space is $\Lambda = [0, 1]$. A Gaussian setting implies the main results of Andrews and Ploberger (1994) apply: the average $\int_\Lambda \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ has the highest weighted average local power for alternatives close to the null.

In view of Gaussianicity, and Theorem S.1.1 in the supplemental material Hill (2015), it can be shown $\{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\} \Rightarrow^* \{(\mathcal{Z}(\lambda) + c(\lambda)b)^2\}$, where $c(\lambda) = E[\exp\{2\lambda x_t\}]/(E[\epsilon_t^2 \exp\{2\lambda x_t\}])^{1/2} = (E[\exp\{2\lambda x_t\}])^{1/2} = \exp\{\lambda^2\}$, and $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\}$ is a zero mean Gaussian process with *almost surely* uniformly continuous sample paths, and covariance function $E[\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\mathcal{Z}(\tilde{\lambda})] = \exp\{-.5(\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})^2\}$.

Local asymptotic power is therefore:

$$\text{PVOT: } P\left(\int_0^1 I\left(\bar{F}_{1,0}\left(\left\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)+b\exp\{\lambda^2\}\right\}^2\right)<\alpha\right)d\lambda > c_\alpha^{(pvot)}\right)$$

$$\text{randomized: } P\left(\left\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda_*)+b\exp\{\lambda_*^2\}\right\}^2 > c_\alpha^{(rand)}\right)$$

$$\text{average: } P\left(\int_0^1\left\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)+b\exp\{\lambda^2\}\right\}^2 d\lambda > c_\alpha^{(ave)}\right)$$

$$\text{supremum: } P\left(\sup_{\lambda\in[0,1]}\left\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)+b\exp\{\lambda^2\}\right\}^2 > c_\alpha^{(\sup)}\right),$$

where $\bar{F}_{1,0}$ is the upper tail probability of a $\chi^2(1)$ distribution; λ_* is a uniform random variable on Λ, independent of $\{\epsilon_t, x_t\}$; and $c_\alpha^{(\cdot)}$ are level α asymptotic critical values: $c_\alpha^{(pvot)} \equiv \alpha$, and $c_\alpha^{rand)}$ is the $1-\alpha$ quantile from a $\chi^2(1)$ distribution. See below for approximating $\{c_\alpha^{(ave)}, c_\alpha^{(\sup)}\}$.

Local power for Bierens and Ploberger's (1997) ICM statistic $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_n \equiv \int_0^1 \hat{z}_n^2(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ is based on their Theorem 7 critical value upper bound $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_n \geq u_\alpha \int_0^1 v_n^2(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)) \leq \alpha$, where $v_n^2(\lambda)$ $= \exp\{2\lambda^2\}$ satisfies $\sup_{\lambda\in[0,1]}|\hat{v}_n^2(\lambda) - v_n^2(\lambda)| \xrightarrow{p} 0$, and $\{u_{.01}, u_{.05}, u_{.10}\} = \{6.81, 4.26, 3.23\}$. We use a uniform measure $\mu(\lambda) = \lambda$ since this promotes the highest weighted average local power for alternatives near H_0 (Andrews and Ploberger, 1994, Boning and Sowell, 1999). Under H_1^L we have $\{\hat{z}_n(\lambda)\} \Rightarrow^* \{z(\lambda) + b\exp\{\lambda^2\}\}$ for some zero mean Gaussian process $\{z(\lambda)\}$ with *almost surely* uniformly continuous sample paths, and $\int_0^1 v_n^2(\lambda)d\lambda = \int_0^1 \exp\{2\lambda^2\}d\lambda = 2.3645$. This yields local asymptotic power:

$$\text{ICM: } P\left(\int_0^1\left\{z(\lambda)+b\exp\{\lambda^2\})\right\}^2 d\lambda > c_\alpha^{(icm)}\right) \text{ where } c_\alpha^{(icm)} \equiv 2.3645\times u_\alpha.$$

Asymptotically valid critical values can be easily computed for the present experiment by mimicking the steps below, in which case PVOT, average, supremum, and ICM tests are essentially identical. We are, however, interested in how well Bierens and Ploberger's (1997) solution to the problem of non-standard inference compares to existing methods.

Local power is computed as follows. We draw R samples $\{\epsilon_{i,t}, x_{i,t}\}_{t=1}^T$, $i = 1, ..., R$, of iid random variables $(\epsilon_{i,t}, x_{i,t})$ from $N(0,1)$, and draw iid $\lambda_{*,i}$, $i = 1, ..., R$, from a uniform distribution on Λ. Then $\{\mathcal{Z}_{T,i}(\lambda)\} \equiv \{1/\sqrt{T}\sum_{t=1}^T \epsilon_{i,t}\exp\{\lambda x_{i,t} - \lambda^2\}\}$ is a draw from the limit process $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\}$ when $T = \infty$. We draw $R = 100,000$ samples of size $T = 100,000$, and compute

$\mathcal{T}_{T,i}^{(PVOT)}(b) \equiv \int_0^1 I(\bar{F}_{1,0}(\{\mathcal{Z}_{T,i}(\lambda) + b\exp\{\lambda^2\}\}^2) < \alpha)$, $\mathcal{T}_{T,i}^{(ave)}(b) \equiv \int_0^1 \{\mathcal{Z}_{T,i} + b\exp\{\lambda^2\}\}^2 d\lambda$ and $\mathcal{T}_{T,i}^{(\sup)}(b) \equiv \sup_{\lambda\in[0,1]}\{\mathcal{Z}_{T,i}(\lambda) + b\exp\{\lambda^2\}\}^2$ and $\mathcal{T}_{T,i}^{(rand)}(b) \equiv \{\mathcal{Z}_{T,i}(\lambda_{*,i}) + b\exp\{\lambda_{*,i}^2\}\}^2$. The critical values $\{c_\alpha^{(ave)}, c_\alpha^{(\sup)}\}$ are the $1-a$ quantiles of $\{\mathcal{T}_{T,i}^{(ave)}(0), \mathcal{T}_{T,i}^{(\sup)}(0)\}_{i=1}^R$. In the ICM case $\{z_{T,i}(\lambda)\} \equiv \{1/\sqrt{T}\sum_{t=1}^T \epsilon_{i,t}\exp\{\lambda x_{i,t}\}\}$ is a draw from $\{z(\lambda)\}$ when $T=\infty$, hence we compute $\mathcal{T}_{T,i}^{(icm)}(b) \equiv \int_0^1 \{z_{T,i} + b\exp\{\lambda^2\}\}^2 d\lambda$. Local power is $1/R\sum_{i=1}^R I(\mathcal{T}_{T,i}^{(\cdot)}(b) > c_\alpha^{(\cdot)})$. Integrals are computed by the midpoint method based on the discretization $\lambda \in \{.001, .002, ..., .999, 1\}$, hence there are 1000 points ($\lambda = 0$ is excluded because power is trivial in that case).

Figure 1 contains local power plots at level $\alpha = .05$ over drift parameters $b \in [0,2]$ and $b \in [0,7]$. Notice that under the null $b = 0$ each test, except ICM, achieves power of nearly exactly .05 (PVOT, average and supremum are .0499, and randomized is .0511), providing numerical verification that the correct critical value for the PVOT test at level α is simply α. The ICM critical value upper bound leads to an under sized test with asymptotic size .0365.

Second, local power is virtually identical across PVOT, random, average and supremum tests. This is logical since the underlying PV test is consistent on any compact Λ, it has non-trivial local power, and local power is asymptotic. Since the average test has the highest weighted average power aimed at alternatives near the null (Andrews and Ploberger, 1994, eq. (2.5)), we have evidence that PVOT test power is at the highest possible level. The randomized test has slightly lower power for deviations far from the null $b \geq 2.5$ ostensibly because for large b larger values of λ lead to a higher power test, while the randomized λ may be small. Finally, ICM power is lower near the null $b \in (0, 1.5]$ since these alternatives are most difficult to detect, and the test is conservative, but power is essentially identical to the remaining tests for drift $b \geq 1.5$.

5 Examples

We give four examples of tests with nuisance parameters under H_1, covering omitted nonlinearity, one-time structural break, and inclusion of a Box-Cox transform. We then give all theory details for a GARCH test in Section 6. Theory for an omitted nonlinearity test is in Section 4 and Hill (2015). The first two examples are extensions of the test of omitted nonlinearity in Section 4.2.

Example 5.1 (test of Smooth Transition Autoregression) The model is $y_t = \theta_0' x_t + \beta_0' x_t \times \exp\{\lambda_0' x_t\} + \epsilon_t$ where $E[\epsilon_t|x_t] = 0$ $a.s.$ and $\xi_0 \equiv [\theta_0', \beta_0', \lambda_0']' \in \Xi$. This is a variant of the

Exponential Smooth Transition Autoregression (see Terasvirta, 1994). If $H_0 : \beta_0 = 0$ then y_t is linear and λ_0 is not identified, otherwise λ_0 is part of the data generating process. A PVOT test of H_0 is based on an asymptotic LM test with $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ in (12). See Hill (2015, Section S.3) for an extension to the general class of STAR models, with asymptotic theory.

A test of omitted nonlinearity may have both a test specific nuisance parameter λ and estimated weakly identified components.

Example 5.2 (test of omitted nonlinearity in E-STAR) Consider testing whether the model in Example 5.1 is correct. Write $y_t = \theta_0' x_t + \beta_0' x_t \exp\{\pi_0' x_t\} + \epsilon_t = h_t(\xi) + \epsilon_t$ where $\xi_0 \equiv [\theta_0', \beta_0', \pi_0']' \in \Xi$. We want to test $H_0 : E[\epsilon_t | x_t] = 0$ *a.s.* by using the LM statistic $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) = [\hat{v}_n^{-1}(\lambda) n^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^n (y_t - h_t(\hat{\xi}_n)) \mathcal{F}(\lambda' \Psi(x_t))]^2$ in Section 4.2, where $\hat{v}_n^2(\lambda)$ estimates $E[\{n^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^n (y_t - h_t(\hat{\xi}_n)) \mathcal{F}(\lambda' \Psi(x_t))\}^2]$. Notice π_0 is not identified when $\beta_0 = 0$.

A test of H_0 based on $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, where π_0 may not be identified, has been ignored in the literature: either *identification* is assumed (see Terasvirta, 1994, Hill, 2008, for references), or weak identification is allowed under *correct specification* $E[\epsilon_t | x_t] = 0$ *a.s.* (Andrews and Cheng, 2012, 2013, 2014). Andrews and Cheng (2012) develop robust critical values for inference that does not involve a nuisance parameter λ. If $\hat{c}_{n,1-\alpha}(\lambda)$ is such a critical value adapted to our test, then we reject H_0 when $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) > \hat{c}_{n,1-\alpha}(\lambda)$, hence we use the Test Statistic Occupation Time $\int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) > \hat{c}_{1-\alpha,n}(\lambda)) d\lambda$. Under regularity conditions, $\hat{c}_{n,1-\alpha}(\lambda)$ leads to an asymptotically correctly sized tests, uniformly on Λ: see Hill (2015, Section S.3) for theory details.

Example 5.3 (structural break) The model is $y_t = \theta_t' x_t + \epsilon_t$ where θ_t may depend on t, and standard asymptotics apply for the least squares estimator. We want to test for parameter constancy $H_0 : \theta_t = \theta_0 \; \forall t$, against a one-time change point $H_1 : \theta_t = \theta_1$ for $t = 1, ..., [\lambda n]$ and $\theta_t = \theta_1$ for $t = [\lambda n] + 1, ..., n$. The parameters θ_i are constants, and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ is a nuisance parameter under H_1. Wald, LM and LR statistics can be constructed. For example, the unrestricted model is $y_t = \theta_0' x_{n,t}(\lambda) + \epsilon_t$ where $x_{n,t}(\lambda) = [x_t' I(1 \leq t \leq [\lambda n]), x_t' I([\lambda n] + 1 \leq t \leq n)]'$ and $\theta_0 = [\theta_1', \theta_2']'$. Let $\hat{\theta}_n(\lambda) = [\hat{\theta}_{1,n}(\lambda)', \hat{\theta}_{2,n}(\lambda)']'$ be the least squares estimator, and let selection matrix $\mathcal{R}$ satisfy $\mathcal{R}\theta_0 = \theta_1 - \theta_2$. Then the Wald statistic is $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) = n(\mathcal{R}\hat{\theta}_n(\lambda))'(\mathcal{R}\hat{\mathcal{V}}_n(\lambda)\mathcal{R}')^{-1}(\mathcal{R}\hat{\theta}_n(\lambda))$ where $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_n(\lambda)$ is a uniformly consistent estimator of $nE[(\hat{\theta}_n(\lambda) - \theta_0)(\hat{\theta}_n(\lambda) - \theta_0)']$. Andrews (1993) uses $\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ to control for the unknown λ, where Λ is a compact subset of $(0, 1)$ to

ensure $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ does not diverge under the null, and to promote non-trivial local power and a consistent test (Andrews, 1993, Corollary 2).

The PVOT test applies since $\{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\}$ has a chi-squared limit process under H_0, and the PVOT test is consistent. Simply note that $\sqrt{n}\mathcal{R}\hat{\theta}_n(\lambda) = \sqrt{n}(\theta_1 - \theta_2) + \mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda)$ where $\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda) \equiv \mathcal{R}(E[x_{n,t}(\lambda)x'_{n,t}(\lambda)])^{-1} \times n^{-1/2}\sum_{t=1}^n x_{n,t}(\lambda)\epsilon_t + o_p(1)$, and $\{\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda)\}$ has a Gaussian weak limit under suitable conditions. By the construction of $\mathcal{Z}_n(\lambda)$, Theorem 3.1 applies since $\{x_{n,t}(\lambda)\}$ falls in the VC class of functions (see, e.g., Arcones and Yu, 1994), and the PVOT test is consistent.

Example 5.4 (Box-Cox transform) The model is $y_t = \delta'_0 x_t + \beta_0 z_t(\lambda) + \epsilon_t$, where $z_t(\lambda) = (x_{i,t}^{\lambda} - 1)/\lambda$ if $\lambda \neq 0$ else $z_t(\lambda) = \ln(x_{i,t})$, for some regressor $x_{i,t} \geq 0$ $a.s.$ Define $\theta_0 \equiv [\delta'_0, \beta_0]'$. We want to test $H_0 : \beta_0 = 0$ against $H_1 : \beta_0 \neq 0$, hence λ is not defined under H_0. Let the least squares estimator for some imputed λ be $\hat{\theta}_n(\lambda)$, and assume standard regularity conditions exist for asymptotic normality of a suitably normalized $\hat{\theta}_n(\lambda)$. A PVOT test is therefore straightforward.

6 PVOT Test of No GARCH Effects

Consider a stationary GARCH(1,1) model (Bollerslev, 1986, Nelson, 1990):

$$\begin{aligned} &y_t = \sigma_t\epsilon_t \text{ where } \epsilon_t \text{ is iid, } E[\epsilon_t] = 0,\ E[\epsilon_t^2] = 1, \text{ and } E\left|\epsilon_t\right|^r < \infty \text{ for } r > 4 \\ &\sigma_t^2 = \omega_0 + \delta_0 y_{t-1}^2 + \lambda_0\sigma_{t-1}^2 \text{ where } \omega_0 > 0,\ \delta_0, \lambda_0 \in [0,1), \text{ and } E\left[\ln\left(\delta_0\epsilon_t^2 + \lambda_0\right)\right] < 0. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Under H_0: $\delta_0 = 0$ if the starting value is $\sigma_0^2 = \tilde{\omega} = \omega_0/(1 - \lambda_0) > 0$ then $\sigma_1^2 = \omega_0 + \lambda_0\omega_0/(1 - \lambda_0) = \tilde{\omega}$ and so on under H_0, hence $\sigma_t^2 = \tilde{\omega}\ \forall t \geq 0$. In this case the σ_{t-1}^2 marginal effect λ_0 is not identified. Further, $\delta_0, \lambda_0 \geq 0$ must be maintained during estimation to ensure a positive conditional variance, and because this includes a boundary value, QML asymptotics are non-standard (Andrews, 1999, 2001).

Let $\theta = [\omega, \delta, \lambda]$, and define the parameter subset $\pi = [\omega, \delta]' \in \Pi \equiv [\iota_\omega, u_\omega] \times [0, 1 - \iota_\delta]$ for tiny $(\iota_\omega, \iota_\delta) > 0$ and some $u_\omega > 0$. Express the volatility process as $\sigma_t^2(\pi, \lambda) = \omega + \delta y_{t-1}^2 + \lambda\sigma_{t-1}^2(\pi, \lambda)$ for an imputed $\lambda \in \Lambda \equiv [0, 1 - \iota_\lambda]$ and tiny $\iota_\lambda > 0$. Let $\hat{\pi}_n(\lambda) = [\hat{\omega}_n(\lambda), \hat{\delta}_n(\lambda)]' \equiv \arg\min_{\pi\in\Pi} 1/n\sum_{t=1}^n\{\ln(\sigma_t^2(\pi, \lambda)) + y_t^2/\sigma_t^2(\pi, \lambda)\}$, the unrestricted QML estimator of π_0 for a

given $\lambda \in \Lambda$. The test statistic is (Andrews, 2001):

$$\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) = n\hat{\delta}_n^2(\lambda). \tag{15}$$

Theorem 6.1 *Let* $\{y_t\}$ *be generated by process (14). Assumption 1 applies where* $\mathcal{T}(\lambda) = (\max\{0, \mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\})^2$*, and* $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\}$ *is a zero mean Gaussian process with a version that has* almost surely *uniformly continuous sample paths, and covariance function* $E[\mathcal{Z}(\lambda_1)\mathcal{Z}(\lambda_2)] = (1 - \lambda_1^2)(1 - \lambda_2^2)/(1 - \lambda_1\lambda_2)$.

A simulation procedure can be used to approximate the asymptotic p-value (cf. Andrews, 2001). Draw $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathbb{N}$ samples of iid standard normal random variables $\{Z_{j,i}\}_{j=1}^{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}}$, $i = 1, ..., \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$, and compute $\mathfrak{Z}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},i}(\lambda) \equiv (1 - \lambda^2)\sum_{j=0}^{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}} \lambda^j Z_{j,i}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},i}(\lambda) \equiv (\max\{0, \mathfrak{Z}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},i}(\lambda)\})^2$. Notice $\mathfrak{Z}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}}(\lambda) \equiv (1 - \lambda^2)\sum_{j=0}^{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}} \lambda^j Z_j$ is zero mean Gaussian with the same covariance function as $\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)$ when $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}} = \infty$, hence $\{\mathcal{T}_{\infty,i}(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is an independent draw from the limit process $\{\mathcal{T}(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$. The p-value approximation is $\hat{p}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},\widetilde{\mathcal{M}},n}(\lambda) \equiv 1/\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}\sum_{i=1}^{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} I(\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},i}(\lambda) > \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda))$. Since we can choose $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ to be arbitrarily large, we can make $\hat{p}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},\widetilde{\mathcal{M}},n}(\lambda)$ close to the asymptotic p-value by the Glivenko-Cantelli theorem. Now compute the PVOT $\mathcal{P}^*_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},\widetilde{\mathcal{M}},n}(\alpha) \equiv \int_\Lambda I(\hat{p}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},\widetilde{\mathcal{M}},n}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda$.

Theorem 6.2 *Let* $\{y_t\}$ *be generated by the process in (14), and let* $\{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_n, \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ *be sequences of positive integers,* $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_n \to \infty$ *and* $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_n \to \infty$*. If* H_0 *is true then* $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}^*_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_n,\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_n,n}(\alpha) > \alpha) \in (0, \alpha]$*, and otherwise* $P(\mathcal{P}^*_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_n,\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_n,n}(\alpha) > \alpha) \to 1$.

Remark 7 Under H_0, $h(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)) \xrightarrow{d} h(\mathcal{T}(\lambda))$ for mappings $h : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, continuous *a.e.*, by exploiting theory in Andrews (2001, Section 4). The relevant simulated p-value is $\hat{p}^{(h)}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},\widetilde{\mathcal{M}},n} \equiv 1/\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}\sum_{i=1}^{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}} I(h(\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},i}(\lambda)) > h(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)))$. Arguments used to prove Theorem 6.2 easily lead to a proof that $\hat{p}^{(h)}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},\widetilde{\mathcal{M}},n}$ is consistent for the corresponding asymptotic p-value.

7 Simulation Study

We perform two Monte Carlo experiments concerning tests of functional form and GARCH effects. We use the same discretized Λ for PVOT and bootstrap p-value tests, and integrals are discretized using the midpoint method. Wild bootstrapped p-values are computed with $R = 1000$

samples of iid standard normal random variables $\{z_{t,i}\}_{t=1}^n$. Sample sizes are $n \in \{100, 250, 500\}$ and $10,000$ samples $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^n$ are drawn in each case.

7.1 Test of Functional Form

Samples $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^n$ are drawn from one of four data generating processes. In the first two cases, the process is linear $y_t = 2x_t + \epsilon_t$ or quadratic $y_t = 2x_t + .1x_t^2 + \epsilon_t$, where $\{x_t, \epsilon_t\}$ are iid standard normal random variables. The third and fourth are time series processes with a lagged dependent variable as regressor $x_t = y_{t-1}$: AR(1) $y_t = .9x_t + \epsilon_t$ or Self-Exciting Threshold AR(1) $y_t = .9x_t - .4x_t I(x_t > 0) + \epsilon_t$, where ϵ_t is iid standard normal random. In the time series cases we draw $2n$ observations with starting values $y_1 = \epsilon_1$ and retain the last n observations. Now write $\sum$ for sample summations: for iid data $\sum = \sum_{t=1}^n$ and for time series $\sum = \sum_{t=2}^n$.

The estimated model is $y_t = \beta x_t + \epsilon_t$, and we test $H_0 : E[y_t|x_t] = \beta_0 x_t$ *a.s.* for some β_0. We compute $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ in (12) with logistic $F(\Psi(x_t)) = (1 + \exp\{\Psi(x_t)\})^{-1}$ and $\Psi(x_t) = \arctan(x_t^*)$, where $x_t^* \equiv x_t - 1/n \sum x_t$.[3] Write $F_t(\lambda) = F(\lambda\Psi(x_t))$, let $\hat{\beta}_n$ be the least squares estimator, and define $\hat{z}_n(\lambda) \equiv 1/n^{1/2} \sum (y_t - \hat{\beta}_n x_t) F_t(\lambda)$. Then $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) \equiv \hat{z}_n^2(\lambda)/\hat{v}_n^2(\lambda)$ with variance estimator $\hat{v}_n^2(\lambda) \equiv 1/n \sum (y_t - \hat{\beta}_n x_t)^2 \hat{w}_{n,t}^2(\lambda)$, where $\hat{w}_{n,t}(\lambda) \equiv F_t(\lambda) - \hat{b}_n(\lambda)' \hat{A}_n^{-1} x_t$, $\hat{b}_n \equiv 1/n \sum x_t F_t(\lambda)$ and $\hat{A}_n \equiv 1/n \sum x_t x_t'$ (see White, 1989, cf. Bierens, 1990). $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ satisfies Theorem S.1.1 in Hill (2015), hence weak convergence (13) applies, and $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ is pointwise asymptotically $\chi^2(1)$ under H_0.

We perform four tests. First, the PVOT over $\Lambda = [.0001, 1]$ based on the asymptotic p-value for $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$. The discretized subset of nuisance parameters used is $\Lambda_n \equiv \{.0001 + 1/(\varpi n)$, $.0001 + 2/(\varpi n)$, ..., $.0001 + \bar{\imath}_n(\varpi)/(\varpi n)\}$ where $\bar{\imath}_n(\varpi) \equiv \text{argmax}\{1 \leq i \leq \varpi n : i \leq .9999\varpi n\}$, with a coarseness parameter $\varpi = 100$. We can use a much smaller ϖ if the sample size is large enough (e.g. $\varpi = 10$ when $n = 250$, or $\varpi = 1$ when $n \geq 500$), but in general small ϖn leads to over-rejection of H_0.

Second, we use $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda_*)$ with a uniformly randomized $\lambda_* \in \Lambda$ and an asymptotic p-value. Third, $\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ and $\int_{\Lambda_n} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ with uniform measure $\mu(\lambda)$, and wild bootstrapped p-values. Fourth, Bierens and Ploberger's (1997) ICM $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_n \equiv \int_{\Lambda_n} \hat{z}_n^2(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$ with uniform $\mu(\lambda)$,

[3] Summations in the time series case are $\sum_{t=2}^n$.

and the level α critical value upper bound $c_\alpha \int_\Lambda \hat{v}_n^2(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$, where $\{c_{.01}, c_{.05}, c_{.10}\} = \{6.81, 4.26, 3.23\}$.

Rejection frequencies for $\alpha \in \{.01, .05, .10\}$ are reported in Table 1. The ICM test tends to be under sized, as expected. Randomized, average and supremum tests have accurate size for iid data, but exhibit size distortions for time series data when $n \in \{100, 250\}$. The PVOT test has relatively sharp size in nearly every case, but is slightly over-sized for time series data when $n = 100$. All tests except the supremum test have comparable power, while the ICM test has low power at $\alpha = .01$. The supremum test has the lowest power, although its local power was essentially identical to the average and PVOT tests for a similar test of omitted nonlinearity.

In the time series case, however, PVOT power when $n = 100$ is lower than all other tests, except the supremum test in general and the ICM test at level $\alpha = .01$. PVOT rejection frequencies are $\{.135, .206, .645\}$ for tests at levels $\{.01, .05, .10\}$, while randomized, average, supremum and ICM power are $\{.135, .592, .846\}$, $\{.062, .412, .726\}$, $\{.021, .209, .561\}$ and $\{.004, .643, .866\}$ respectively. These discrepancies, however, vanish when $n \in \{250, 500\}$. The ICM test has dismal power at the 1% level when $n \leq 250$ and much lower power than all other tests when $n = 500$, but comparable or better power at levels 5% and 10%. In summary, across cases the various tests are comparable; supremum test power is noticeably lower in many case; and the PVOT test generally exhibits fewer size distortions, and lower power for dependent data with a small sample size. Of particular note, the accuracy of PVOT size provides further evidence that the PVOT asymptotic critical value is identically α.

In Figure 2 we plot typical p-value sample paths with occupation times when $n = 250$. The sample paths are exceptionally smooth. In the iid linear case the occupation times are below the respective significance levels, hence we fail to reject the null. In the iid quadratic case, the p-values are never below .01, but always below .05, hence occupation times are $\{0, 1.0, 1.0\}$: we therefore reject the null at the 5% and 10% levels. The time series cases are similar.

7.2 Test of GARCH Effects

Samples $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^n$ are drawn from a GARCH process $y_t = \sigma_t \epsilon_t$ and $\sigma_t^2 = \omega_0 + \delta_0 y_{t-1}^2 + \lambda_0 \sigma_{t-1}^2$ with parameter values $\omega_0 = 1$, $\lambda_0 = .6$, and $\delta_0 = 0$ or .3, where ϵ_t is iid $N(0, 1)$. The initial condition is

$\sigma_0^2 = \omega_0/(1-\lambda_0) = 2.5$. Simulation results are qualitatively similar for other values $\lambda_0 \in (0,1)$. Put $\Lambda = [.01, .99]$ with discretized $\Lambda_n \equiv \{.01 + 1/(\varpi n), .01 + 2/(\varpi n), ..., .01 + \bar{\imath}_n(\varpi)/(\varpi n)\}$, where $\bar{\imath}_n(\varpi) \equiv \text{argmax}\{1 \leq i \leq \varpi n : i \leq .98\varpi n\}$, with coarseness $\varpi = 1$. A finer grid based on $\varpi = 10$ or 100, for example, leads to improved empirical size at the 1% level for the PVOT test, and more severe size distortions for the supremum test. The cost, however, is computation time since a QML estimator *and* bootstrapped p-value are required for each sample.

We estimate $\pi_0 = [\omega_0, \delta_0]'$ by QML for fixed $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$, with criterion $Q_n(\pi, \lambda) = \sum\{\ln \sigma_t^2(\pi, \lambda) + y_t^2/\sigma_t^2(\pi, \lambda)\}$ where $\sigma_t^2(\pi, \lambda) = \omega + \alpha y_{t-1}^2 + \lambda \sigma_{t-1}^2(\pi, \lambda)$, and $\sigma_0^2(\pi, \lambda) = \omega/(1-\lambda)$. The estimator is $\hat{\pi}_n(\lambda) = [\hat{\omega}_n(\lambda), \hat{\delta}_n(\lambda)]' = \arg\min_{\pi \in \Pi} Q_n(\pi, \lambda)$ with space $\Pi = [.001, 2] \times [0, .99]$.[4]

The test statistic is $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) = n\hat{\delta}_n(\lambda)^2$, where the p-value approximation $\hat{p}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},\widetilde{\mathcal{M}},n}(\lambda)$ is computed by the method in Section 6 with $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = 10,000$ simulated samples of size $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}} = 25,000$. We handle the nuisance parameter λ by uniformly randomizing it; computing the PVOT; and computing $\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ and $\int_\Lambda \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\mu(d\lambda)$, along with corresponding wild bootstrapped p-values $\hat{p}^{(\cdot)}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}},\widetilde{\mathcal{M}},n}$ detailed in Remark 7.

Consult Table 2 for simulation results. The randomized test under rejects the null, and has lower size adjusted power than the remaining tests. Andrews' (2001) proposed supremum test is highly over-sized, resulting in relatively low size adjusted power. The best tests in terms of size and size adjusted power are the PVOT and average tests. The average test tends to under reject the null at each level for sample sizes $n \in \{100, 250\}$, and the PVOT test tends to over reject the null at the 1% level for $n \in \{100, 250\}$. These two tests have comparable size at the largest sample size $n = 500$, and at each sample size they have nearly identical power (although PVOT test power is slightly higher at $n = 100$). Recall the average test has the highest weighted average power for alternatives near the null (Andrews and Ploberger, 1994), hence the PVOT test performs on par with an optimal test. Finally, again the PVOT size performance suggests the asymptotic critical value is α.

Figure 3 shows various p-value sample paths and occupation times when $n = 250$. The QML estimator, and therefore p-value, has roughly smooth sample paths, although it appears to be

[4]We compute $\hat{\pi}_n(\lambda)$ using Matlab R2015a's built-in *fmincon* routine for constrained optimization, with numerical approximations for the first and second derivatives. We cease computation iterations when the numerical gradient, or the difference in current and recent iteration's $\hat{\pi}_n(\lambda)$, is less than .0001. The initial parameter value is a uniform random uniform draw on Π.

insensitive to very small changes in λ. This is sensible since the QML estimator at the current sample sizes cannot distinguish between close values of λ.

8 Conclusion

Hill and Aguilar (2013) and Hill (2012) develop the p-value occupation time [PVOT] to smooth over a trimming tuning parameter. The idea is extended here to tests when a nuisance parameter is present under the alternative. We show in a likelihood setting that the weighted average local power of a test is identically the weighted average mean ω-PVOT: the mean is with respect to a local alternative, ω-PVOT replaces Lebesgue measure with a measure ω based on the alternative likelihood, and ω-PVOT evaluated under H_0 is identically the PVOT used for our test. If the ω-PVOT uses a flat weight over λ and is evaluated under H_0, then it is identically a point estimate of the rejection probability of the PV test, under H_0. Thus, the PVOT is a natural way to smooth a p-value (or test statistic).

By construction, a critical value upper bound for the PVOT test is the significance level α, making computation and interpretation very simple, and much easier to perform than standard transforms like the average or supremum since these typically require a bootstrapped p-value. If the original test is consistent then so is the PVOT test. A numerical experiment and simulation study suggest the PVOT critical value is *exactly* α for tests of omitted nonlinearity and GARCH effects, and the numerical experiment shows PVOT, average and supremum tests have essentially identical local power for a test of omitted nonlinearity. Since the average transform is the limit of a weighted average power optimal test, PVOT test simplicity does not come with a loss of power, at least for this particular test. We conjecture this carries over to any test consistent on Λ, although a general theoretical result is not yet available. Controlled experiments show that the PVOT test works well in diverse environments, and generally ranks on par with the average test.

Future work should address the exact general relationship between original and PVOT test power, and hopefully shed light on an exact asymptotic critical value for the types of tests treated in this paper.

A Appendix: Proofs

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By Assumption 1 $\{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\} \Rightarrow^* \{\mathcal{T}(\lambda)\}$ under H_0, a process with a version that has *almost surely* uniformly continuous sample paths, and distribution function F_0 that is continuous $\forall \lambda \in \Lambda/S$ where S has measure zero. Furthermore, $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |p_n(\lambda) - \bar{F}_0(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda))| \xrightarrow{p} 0$ where $\bar{F}_0(c) \equiv 1 - F_0(c)$. Therefore, by the continuous mapping theorem $\{p_n(\lambda)\} \Rightarrow^* \{\bar{F}_0(\mathcal{T}(\lambda))\}$. The limit distribution F_0 is continuous on Λ/S, hence $\mathcal{U}(\lambda) \equiv \bar{F}_0(\mathcal{T}(\lambda))$ is for each $\lambda \in \Lambda/S$ uniformly distributed on $[0,1]$. Now exploit the continuous mapping theorem and the fact that S has measure zero to deduce $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) \xrightarrow{d} \int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda$ (see Chapter 2 in Pollard, 1984). Now use Lemma A.1, below, to yield $P(\int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda > \alpha) \leq \alpha$ and each remaining claim. $\mathcal{QED}$.

Lemma A.1 *Let $\{\mathcal{U}(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ be a stochastic process where $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$ is distributed uniform on $[0,1]$, and $\int_\Lambda d\lambda = 1$. Then $P(\int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda > \alpha) \leq \alpha$. In particular, (a) if $\mathcal{U}(\lambda) = \mathcal{U}(\lambda^*) = a.s.\ \forall \lambda \in \Lambda$ and some $\lambda^* \in \Lambda$ then $P(\int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda > \alpha) = \alpha$; (b) if any h-tuple $\{\mathcal{U}(\lambda_1), ..., \mathcal{U}(\lambda_h)\}$ is jointly independent, $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ for each $i \neq j$, and any $h \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda = \alpha$ a.s. hence $P(\int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda > \alpha) = 0$; and (c) if $P(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha, \mathcal{U}(\tilde{\lambda}) < \alpha) > \alpha^2$ on a subset of $\Lambda \times \Lambda$ with positive measure, then $P(\int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda > \alpha) > 0$*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P} \equiv \int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda$. Claims (a) and (b) suffice to prove $P(\mathcal{P} > \alpha) \leq \alpha$. If $P(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) = \mathcal{U}(\lambda^*)) = 1\ \forall \lambda \in \Lambda$ and some λ^* then by uniform distributedness $P(\mathcal{P} > \alpha) = P(\mathcal{U}(\lambda^*) < \alpha) = \alpha$.

Now assume every h-tuple $\{\mathcal{U}(\lambda_1), ..., \mathcal{U}(\lambda_h)\}$ is jointly independent for arbitrary $h \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ for each $i \neq j$. We have by Fubini's theorem $E[\mathcal{P}^2] = \int_{\lambda\neq\tilde{\lambda}} P(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha)P(\mathcal{U}(\tilde{\lambda}) < \alpha)d\lambda d\tilde{\lambda} = \alpha^2$. Since $E[\mathcal{P}] = \alpha$ by Fubini's Theorem and uniformity of $\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$, it follows that $V[\int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda] = 0$, therefore $\mathcal{P} = \alpha$ *a.s.*

Finally, if $P(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha, \mathcal{U}(\tilde{\lambda}) < \alpha) > \alpha^2$ on a subset of $\Lambda \times \Lambda$ with positive measure, then $E[\mathcal{P}^2] > (E[\mathcal{P}]) = \alpha^2$. Since $E[\mathcal{P}^2] = E[\mathcal{P}^2 I(\mathcal{P}^2 > \alpha^2)] + E[\mathcal{P}^2 I(\mathcal{P}^2 \leq \alpha^2)]$, and $\mathcal{P}$ is bounded, by a variant of the second moment method $P(\mathcal{P} > \alpha) \geq (E[\mathcal{P}^2] - \alpha^2)^2/E[\mathcal{P}^4] > 0$. $\mathcal{QED}$.

Proof of Theorem 3.2.

Claim (a). Let H_0 be false, and define the set of $\lambda's$ such that we reject the PV test for sample size n: $\Lambda_{n,\alpha} \equiv \{\lambda \in \Lambda : p_n(\lambda) < \alpha\}$. By construction $\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) \equiv \int_{\Lambda_{n,\alpha}} I(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda + \int_{\Lambda/\Lambda_{n,\alpha}} I(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda = \int_{\Lambda_{n,\alpha}} d\lambda$. Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha) = \lim_{n\to\infty} P(\int_{\Lambda_{n,\alpha}} d\lambda > \alpha)$. Therefore $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha) > 0$ *if and only if* $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\Lambda_{n,\alpha} > \alpha) > 0$, *if and only if* $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha) > 0$ on some subset with measure greater than α..

Claim (b). Let Λ_α denote the set of $\lambda's$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha) = 1$, hence

$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha) < 1$ on Λ/Λ_α. Then by dominated convergence $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha)$ $= \lim_{n\to\infty} P(\int_{\Lambda_\alpha} d\lambda + \int_{\Lambda/\Lambda_\alpha} I(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda > \alpha)$. If Λ_α has measure greater than α then $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha) = 1$. $\mathcal{QED}$.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Recall F_1 is a $\chi^2(1)$ distribution, $\bar{F}_1 \equiv 1 - F_1$, and $F_{1,v}$ is a noncentral chi-squared distribution with noncentrality v. By construction $p_n(\lambda) = \bar{F}_1(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda))$.

In view of (13), under H_1^L it follows $p_n(\lambda) \xrightarrow{d} \bar{F}_1(\mathfrak{T}_b)$, a law on $[0,1]$ where $\mathfrak{T}_b$ is distributed $F_{1,b^2c(\lambda)^2}$. Hence $\bar{F}_1(\mathfrak{T}_b)$ is skewed left for $b \neq 0$. Let $\mathcal{U}_b(\lambda)$ be distributed $\bar{F}_{0,\lambda}(\mathfrak{T}_b)$. Then $\mathcal{U}_0(\lambda)$ is a uniform random variable, and in general $P(\mathcal{U}_b(\lambda) \leq a) - P(\mathcal{U}_0(\lambda) \leq a) > 0$ is monotonically increasing in b since $P(\mathcal{U}_b(\lambda) \leq a) \to 1$ is monotonic as $|b| \to \infty$ for any a.

Now, by construction $\{\mathcal{U}_b(\lambda)\}$ has *almost surely* continuous sample paths with $\mathcal{U}_b(\lambda)$ distributed $F_1(\mathfrak{T}_b)$. Hence under H_1^L by (13), and the continuous mapping theorem:

$$\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) = \int_\Lambda I\left(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha\right) d\lambda \xrightarrow{d} \int_\Lambda I\left(\mathcal{U}_b(\lambda) < \alpha\right) d\lambda.$$

By construction $\int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}_b(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda \geq \int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}_0(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda$ with equality only if $b = 0$: the asymptotic occupation time of a p-value rejection $p_n(\lambda) < \alpha$ is higher under any sequence of non-trivial local alternatives $H_1^L : \beta_0 = b/n^{1/2}$, $b \neq 0$. Further, $\int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}_b(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda \to 1$ as $|b| \to \infty$. Hence as the local deviation from the null increases the probability of a PVOT test rejection of H_1^L approaches one $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\mathcal{P}_n^*(\alpha) > \alpha) \nearrow 1$ for any nominal level $\alpha \in [0,1)$. $\mathcal{QED}$.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Since the GARCH process is stationary and has an iid error with a finite fourth moment, the claim follows from arguments in Andrews (2001, Section 4.1). $\mathcal{QED}$.

Proof of Theorem 6.2. The limit process of $\{\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\}$ under H_0 is $\{\mathcal{T}(\lambda)\}$, where $\mathcal{T}(\lambda) = (\max\{0, \mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\})^2$ and $\{\mathcal{Z}(\lambda)\}$ is Gaussian with covariance $E[\mathcal{Z}(\lambda_1)\mathcal{Z}(\lambda_2)] = (1 - \lambda_1^2)(1 - \lambda_2^2)/(1 - \lambda_1\lambda_2)$. Define $\bar{F}_0(c) = P(\mathcal{T}(\lambda) \geq c)$ and $p_n(\lambda) \equiv \bar{F}_0(\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda))$, the asymptotic p-value. Define $\mathcal{D}_n \equiv \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |\hat{p}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_n,\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_n,n}(\lambda) - p_n(\lambda)|$. Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 apply by Theorem 6.1. Hence, by Lemma A.2, below, and weak convergence arguments developed in the proof of Theorem 3.1, under H_0 for some uniform process $\{\mathcal{U}(\lambda)\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Lambda I\left(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha\right) d\lambda \;\xleftarrow{d}\; \int_\Lambda I\left(p_n(\lambda) - \mathcal{D}_n < \alpha\right) d\lambda \;\leq\; \int_\Lambda I\left(\hat{p}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_n,\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_n,n}(\lambda) < \alpha\right) d\lambda \\ \leq \int_\Lambda I\left(p_n(\lambda) + \mathcal{D}_n < \alpha\right) d\lambda \xrightarrow{d} \int_\Lambda I\left(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha\right) d\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\int_\Lambda I(\hat{p}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_n,\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_n,n}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda \xrightarrow{d} \int_\Lambda I(\mathcal{U}(\lambda) < \alpha)d\lambda$, hence the claim now follows from the proof of Theorem 3.1 and the fact that $\{\mathcal{T}(\lambda)\}$ is weakly dependent in the sense of Lemma A.1.c. $\mathcal{QED}$.

Lemma A.2 $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |\hat{p}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_n,\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_n,n}(\lambda) - p_n(\lambda)| \xrightarrow{p} 0$.

Proof. See the supplemental material Hill (2015).

References

Aguilar, M., and J. B. Hill (2015): "Robust Score and Portmanteau Tests of Volatility Spillover," *Journal of Econometrics*, 184, 37–61.

Andrews, D. W. K. (1993): "Tests for Parameter Instability and Structural Change with Unknown Change Point," *Econometrica*, 61, 821–856.

——— (1999): "Estimation When a Parameter is on a Boundary," *Econometrica*, 67, 1341–1383.

——— (2001): "Testing when a Parameter is on the Boundary of the Maintained Hypothesis," *Econometrica*, 69, 683–734.

Andrews, D. W. K., and X. Cheng (2012): "Estimation and Inference with Weak, Semi-Strong and Strong Identification," *Econometrica*, 80, 2153–2211.

——— (2013): "Maximum Likelihood Estimation and Uniform Inference with Sporadic Identification Failure," *Journal of Econometrics*, 173, 36–56.

——— (2014): "GMM Estimation and Uniform Subvector Inference with Possible Identification Failure," *Econometric Theory*, 30, 287–333.

Andrews, D. W. K., and W. Ploberger (1994): "Optimal Tests when a Nuisance Parameter is Present Only under the Alternative," *Econometrica*, 62, 1383–1414.

——— (1995): "Admissibility of the Likelihood Ratio Test When a Nuisance Parameter is Present Only Under the Alternative," *Annals of Statistics*, 23, 1609–1629.

——— (1996): "Testing for Serial Correlation Against an ARMA(1,1) Process," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91, 1331–1342.

Arcones, M. A., and B. Yu (1994): "Central Limit Theorems for Empirical U-Processes of Stationary Mixing Sequences," *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 7, 47–71.

Bandi, F. M., and P. C. B. Phillips (2007): "A Simple Approach to the Parametric Estimation of Potentially Nonstationary Diffusions," *Journal of Econometrics*, 137, 354–395.

Bartkiewicz, K., A. Jakubowski, T. Mikosch, and O. Wintenberger (2010): "Stable Limits for Sums of Dependent Infinite Variance Random Variables," *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 150, 337–372.

Bierens, H. J. (1982): "Consistent Model Specification Tests," *Journal of Econometrics*, 20, 105–134.

——— (1990): "A Consistent Conditional Moment Test of Functional Form," *Econometrica*, pp. 1443–1458.

Bierens, H. J., and W. Ploberger (1997): "Asymptotic Theory for Integrated Conditional Moment Tests," *Econometrica*, 65, 1129–1151.

Bierens, H. J., and L. Wang (2012): "Integrated Conditional Moment Tests for Parametric Conditional Distributions," *Econometric Theory*, 28, 328–362.

Bollerslev, T. (1986): "Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity," *Journal of Econometrics*, 31, 307–327.

Boning, B. W., and F. Sowell (1999): "Optimality for the Integrated Conditional Moment Test," *Econometric Theory*, 15, 710–718.

Chernoff, H., and S. Zacks (1964): "Estimating the Current Mean of a Normal Distribution which Is Subject to Changes in Time," *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35, 999–1028.

Dagenais, M. G., and J.-M. Dufour (1991): "Invariance, Nonlinear Models, and Asymptotic Tests," *Econometrica*, 59, 1601–1615.

Davies, R. (1977): "Hypothesis Testing when a Nuisance Parameter is Present Only under the Alternative," *Biometrika*, 64, 247–254.

——— (1987): "Hypothesis Testing when a Nuisance Parameter is Present Only under the Alternative," *Biometrika*, 74, 33–43.

Dudley, R. M. (1967): "The Sizes of Compact Subsets of Hilbert Space and Continuity of Gaussian Processes," *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 1, 290–330.

——— (1978): "Central Limit Theorems for Empirical Measures," *Annals of Probability*, 6, 899–929.

Dufour, J.-M. (1997): "Some Impossibility Theorems in Econometrics With Applications to Structural and Dynamic Models," *Econometrica*, 65, 1365–1387.

Engle, R., D. Lilien, and R. Robins (1987): "Estimating Time Varying Risk Premia in the Term Structure: The ARCH-M Model," *Econometrica*, 55, 391–407.

Ghysels, E., P. Santa-Clara, and R. Valkanov (2004): "The MIDAS Touch: Mixed Data Sampling Regression," *Working Paper, UNC and UCLA*.

Gine, E., and J. Zinn (1984): "Some Limit Theorems for Empirical Processes," *Annals of Probability*, 12, 929–989.

Hansen, B. E. (1996): "Inference When a Nuisance Parameter Is Not Identified Under the Null Hypothesis," *Econometrica*, 64, 413–430.

Hill, J. B. (2008): "Consistent and Non-Degenerate Model Specification Tests Against Smooth Transition and Neural Network Alternatives," *Annales D' Economie et de Statistique*, 90, 145–179.

——— (2012): "Heavy-Tail and Plug-In Robust Consistent Conditional Moment Tests of Functional Form," in *Festschrift in Honor of Hal White*, ed. by X. Chen, and N. Swanson, pp. 241–274. Springer: New York.

——— (2013): "Stochastically Weighted Average Conditional Moment Tests of Functional Form," *Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics and Econometrics*, 17, 121–141.

——— (2015): "Supplemental Material for 'An Empirical Process P-Value Test for Handling Nuisance and Tuning Parameters'," Dept. of Economics, University of North Carolina.

Hill, J. B., and M. Aguilar (2013): "Moment Condition Tests for Heavy Tailed Time Series," *Journal of Econometrics*, 172, 255–274.

Hoffman-Jϕrgensen, J. (1991): "Convergence of Stochastic Processes on Polish Spaces," in *Various Publications Series 39*. Aarhus Universitet, Aarhus, Denmark, mimeo.

King, M., and T. Shively (1993): "Locally Optimal Testing When a Nuisance Parameter is Present Only Under the Alternative," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 75, 1–7.

Künsch, H. R. (1989): "The Jackknife and the Bootstrap for General Stationary Observations," *Annals of Statistics*, 17, 1217–1241.

Linton, O., and Z. Xiao (2013): "Estimation of and Inference about the Expected Shortfall for Time Series with Infinite Variance," *Econometric Theory*, 29, 771–807.

Nadaraya, E. A. (1964): "On Estimating Regression," *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 9, 141–142.

Nelson, D. (1990): "Stationarity and Persistence in the GARCH(1,1) Model," *Econometric Theory*, 6, 318–334.

Nyblom, J. (1989): "Testing for the Constancy of Parameters over Time," *Journal of the American Statistical Association,*, 84, 223–230.

Pfanzagl, J. (1993): "Incidental Versus Random Nuisance Parameters," *Annals of Statistics*, 21, 1663–1691.

Phillips, P. C. B., and P. Perron (1989): "Testing for a Unit Root in Time Series Regression," *Biometrika*, 75, 335–346.

Pollard, D. (1984): *Convergence of Stochastic Processes*. Springer, New York.

Shao, X. (2010): "The Dependent Wild Bootstrap," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105, 218–235.

Stinchcombe, M., and H. White (1998): "Consistent Specification Testing with Nuisance Parameters Present Only Under the Alternative," *Econometric Theory*, 14, 295–325.

Terasvirta, T. (1994): "Specification, Estimation, and Evaluation of Smooth Transition Autoregressive Models," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89, 208 218.

WALD, A. (1943): "Tests of Statistical Hypotheses Concerning Several Parameters When the Number of Observations Is Large," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 12, 1–19.

WHITE, H. (1989): "An Additional Hidden Unit Test for Neglected Nonlinearity in Multilayer Feedforward Networks," in *Proceeding of the International Joint Conference on Neural Networks, II*, pp. 451–455, Washington, D.C. New York, NY. IEEE Press.

Figure 1: Local Power for PVOT, Randomized, Average, Supremum and ICM Tests of Omitted Nonlinearity : null model is $y_t = \beta_0 x_t + \epsilon_t$



(a) Local power over drift $b \in [0, 2]$

(b) Local power over drift $b \in [0, 7]$

Figure 2: Test of Omitted Nonlinearity Example p-Values (Occupation Time $= \int_\Lambda I\left(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha\right) d\lambda$ for $\alpha \in \{.01, .05, .10\}$) : null model is $y_t = \beta_0 x_t + \epsilon_t$



(a) Null is true: y_t is iid linear



(b) Null is false: y_t is iid quadratic



(c) Null is true: y_t is linear AR



(d) Null is false: y_t is Self-Exciting AR

Figure 3: GARCH Test Example p-Values (Occupation Time $= \int_{\Lambda} I\left(p_n(\lambda) < \alpha\right) d\lambda$ for $\alpha \in \{.01, .05, .10\}$) : null volatility is $\sigma_t^2 = 1 + \lambda_0 y_t^2 + \delta_0 \sigma_{t-1}^2$ where $\lambda_0 = .6$ and $\delta_0 = 0$



(a) Null is true: $\delta_0 = 0$



(b) Null is true: $\delta_0 = 0$



(c) Null is False: $\delta_0 > 0$



(d) Null is False: $\delta_0 > 0$

Table 1: Function Form Test Rejection Frequencies

iid data: linear vs. quadratic											
		$n = 100$			$n = 250$			$n = 500$		
Hyp[a]	Test	1%	5%	10%	1%	5%	10%	1%	5%	10%
H_0	$\mathcal{T}_n$-supremum[b]	.004[c]	.037	.097	.008	.041	.083	.019	.058	.096
	$\mathcal{T}_n$-average	.014	.057	.116	.007	.040	.088	.018	.071	.109
	$\mathcal{T}_n$-random[d]	.014	.056	.117	.011	.045	.094	.021	.059	.109
	ICM[e]	.001	.033	.086	.001	.014	.075	.003	.062	.086
	PVOT[f]	.013	.056	.116	.010	.044	.092	.014	.063	.108
H_1	$\mathcal{T}_n$-supremum	.051	.156	.251	.160	.331	.512	.354	.539	.743
	$\mathcal{T}_n$-average	.051	.211	.316	.193	.377	.576	.412	.643	.776
	$\mathcal{T}_n$-random	.051	.221	.316	.212	.392	.586	.404	.668	.798
	ICM	.001	.149	.329	.043	.330	.606	.163	.678	.809
	PVOT	.058	.224	.320	.232	.391	.604	.404	.584	.783
time series data: AR vs. SETAR										
		$n = 100$			$n = 250$			$n = 500$		
Hyp	Test	1%	5%	10%	1%	5%	10%	1%	5%	10%
H_0	$\mathcal{T}_n$-supremum	.001	.003	.039	.002	.012	.036	.003	.052	.124
	$\mathcal{T}_n$-average	.002	.022	.082	.002	.013	.066	.008	.072	.132
	$\mathcal{T}_n$-random	.021	.113	.193	.001	.03	.114	.018	.082	.143
	ICM	.002	.058	.132	.000	.030	.066	.005	.038	.089
	PVOT	.016	.076	.145	.011	.047	.115	.016	.061	.114
H_1	$\mathcal{T}_n$-supremum	.021	.209	.561	.685	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	$\mathcal{T}_n$-average	.062	.412	.726	.888	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	$\mathcal{T}_n$-random	.135	.592	.846	.960	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	ICM	.004	.643	.866	.108	.928	1.00	.712	1.00	1.00
	PVOT	.135	.206	.645	.957	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

a. H_0 is $E[\epsilon|x] = 0$. b. $\mathcal{T}_n$-sup and $\mathcal{T}_n$-ave: p-value tests based on Hansen's (1996) approximate p-value. c. Rejection frequency at the given level. Empirical power is not size-adjusted. d. $\mathcal{T}_n$-random: $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ with randomized λ on [0,1]. e. The ICM test is based on critical value upper bounds in Bierens and Ploberger (1997). f. PVOT: *p-value occupation time* test.

Table 2: GARCH Effects Test Rejection Frequencies

	$n = 100$			$n = 250$			$n = 500$		
Test	1%	5%	10%	1%	5%	10%	1%	5%	10%
No GARCH Effects (empirical size)[a]									
$\mathcal{T}_n$-supremum[b]	.160[c]	.198	.248	.148	.188	.224	.241	.294	.321
$\mathcal{T}_n$-average	.004	.032	.052	.005	.031	.059	.008	.053	.107
$\mathcal{T}_n$-random[d]	.004	.004	.012	.007	.017	.027	.003	.028	.038
PVOT[e]	.024	.062	.112	.019	.059	.091	.015	.063	.111
GARCH Effects (empirical power)									
$\mathcal{T}_n$-supremum	.848	.934	.934	.976	.979	.988	1.00	1.00	1.00
$\mathcal{T}_n$-average	.733	.891	.904	.974	.978	.986	1.00	1.00	1.00
$\mathcal{T}_n$-random	.446	.555	.633	.756	.818	.846	.873	.923	.935
PVOT	.788	.914	.914	.975	.988	.988	1.00	1.00	1.00
GARCH Effects (size adjusted power)									
$\mathcal{T}_n$-supremum	.698	.786	.786	.838	.841	.864	.769	.756	.779
$\mathcal{T}_n$-average	.739	.909	.952	.979	.997	1.00	1.00	.997	.993
$\mathcal{T}_n$-random	.452	.601	.721	.759	.851	.919	.880	.945	.997
PVOT	.774	.902	.902	.966	.979	.997	.995	.987	.989

a. The GARCH volatility process is $\sigma_t^2 = \omega_0 + \delta_0 y_{t-1}^2 + \lambda_0 \sigma_{t-1}^2$ with initial condition $\sigma_t^2 = \omega_0/(1-\lambda_0)$). The null hypothesis is no GARCH effects $\delta_0 = 0$, and under the alternative $\delta_0 = .3$. In all cases the true $\lambda_0 = .6$. b. $\mathcal{T}_n$-sup and $\mathcal{T}_n$-ave: p-value tests based on Hansen's (1996) approximate p-value. c. Rejection frequency at the given significance level. Empirical power is not size-adjusted. d. $\mathcal{T}_n$-random: $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ with randomized λ on [.01,.99]. e. PVOT: *p-value occupation time* test.